NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

No. DCV.

DECEMBER 21, 1906.

CHAPTERS FROM MY AUTOBIOGRAPHY.—VIII.*

BY MARK TWAIN.

PREFATORY NOTE.—Mr. Clemens began to write his autobiography many years ago, and he continues to add to it day by day. It was his original intention to permit no publication of his memoirs until after his death; but, after leaving "Pier No. 70," he concluded that a considerable portion might now suitably be given to the public. It is that portion, garnered from the quarter-million of words already written, which will appear in this REVIEW during the coming year. No part of the autobiography will be published in book form during the lifetime of the author.—EDITOR N. A. R.

[*Dictated in 1906.*] In those early days duelling suddenly became a fashion in the new Territory of Nevada, and by 1864 everybody was anxious to have a chance in the new sport, (1864.) mainly for the reason that he was not able to thoroughly respect himself so long as he had not killed or crippled somebody in a duel or been killed or crippled in one himself.

At that time I had been serving as city editor on Mr. Goodman's Virginia City "Enterprise" for a matter of two years. I was twenty-nine years old. I was ambitious in several ways, but

*Copyright, 1906, by HARPER & BROTHERS. All Rights Reserved.

Copyright, 1906, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All Rights Reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I had entirely escaped the seductions of that particular craze. I had had no desire to fight a duel; I had no intention of provoking one. I did not feel respectable, but I got a certain amount of satisfaction out of feeling safe. I was ashamed of myself; the rest of the staff were ashamed of me—but I got along well enough. I had always been accustomed to feeling ashamed of myself, for one thing or another, so there was no novelty for me in the situation. I bore it very well. Plunkett was on the staff; R. M. Daggett was on the staff. These had tried to get into duels, but for the present had failed, and were waiting. Goodman was the only one of us who had done anything to shed credit upon the paper. The rival paper was the Virginia "Union." Its editor for a little while was Tom Fitch, called the "silver-tongued orator of Wisconsin"—that was where he came from. He tuned up his oratory in the editorial columns of the "Union," and Mr. Goodman invited him out and modified him with a bullet. I remember the joy of the staff when Goodman's challenge was accepted by Fitch. We ran late that night, and made much of Joe Goodman. He was only twenty-four years old; he lacked the wisdom which a person has at twenty-nine, and he was as glad of being *it* as I was that I wasn't. He chose Major Graves for his second (that name is not right, but it's close enough; I don't remember the Major's name). Graves came over to instruct Joe in the duelling art. He had been a Major under Walker, the "gray-eyed man of destiny," and had fought all through that remarkable man's filibustering campaign in Central America. That fact gauges the Major. To say that a man was a Major under Walker, and came out of that struggle ennobled by Walker's praise, is to say that the Major was not merely a brave man but that he was brave to the very utmost limit of that word. All of Walker's men were like that. I knew the Gillis family intimately. The father made the campaign under Walker, and with him one son. They were in the memorable Plaza fight, and stood it out to the last against overwhelming odds, as did also all of the Walker men. The son was killed at the father's side. The father received a bullet through the eye. The old man—for he was an old man at the time—wore spectacles, and the bullet and one of the glasses went into his skull and remained there. There were some other sons: Steve, George, and Jim, very young chaps—the merest lads—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who wanted to be in the Walker expedition, for they had their father's dauntless spirit. But Walker wouldn't have them; he said it was a serious expedition, and no place for children.

The Major was a majestic creature, with a most stately and dignified and impressive military bearing, and he was by nature and training courteous, polite, graceful, winning; and he had that quality which I think I have encountered in only one other man—Bob Howland—a mysterious quality which resides in the eye; and when that eye is turned upon an individual or a squad, in warning, that is enough. The man that has that eye doesn't need to go armed; he can move upon an armed desperado and quell him and take him prisoner without saying a single word. I saw Bob Howland do that, once—a slender, good-natured, amiable, gentle, kindly little skeleton of a man, with a sweet blue eye that would win your heart when it smiled upon you, or turn cold and freeze it, according to the nature of the occasion.

The Major stood Joe up straight; stood Steve Gillis up fifteen paces away; made Joe turn right side towards Steve, cock his navy six-shooter—that prodigious weapon—and hold it straight down against his leg; told him that *that* was the correct position for the gun—that the position ordinarily in use at Virginia City (that is to say, the gun straight up in the air, then brought slowly down to your man) was all wrong. At the word "*One,*" you must raise the gun slowly and steadily to the place on the other man's body that you desire to convince. Then, after a pause, "*two, three—fire—Stop!*" At the word "stop," you may fire—but not earlier. You may give yourself as much time as you please *after* that word. Then, when you fire, you may advance and go on firing at your leisure and pleasure, if you can get any pleasure out of it. And, in the meantime, the other man, if he has been properly instructed and is alive to his privileges, is advancing on *you,* and firing—and it is always likely that more or less trouble will result.

Naturally, when Joe's revolver had risen to a level it was pointing at Steve's breast, but the Major said "No, that is not wise. Take all the risks of getting murdered yourself, but don't run any risk of murdering the other man. If you survive a duel you want to survive it in such a way that the memory of it will not linger along with you through the rest of your life and interfere with your sleep. Aim at your man's leg; not at the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

knee, not above the knee; for those are dangerous spots. Aim below the knee; cripple him, but leave the rest of him to his mother."

By grace of these truly wise and excellent instructions, Joe tumbled Fitch down next morning with a bullet through his lower leg, which furnished him a permanent limp. And Joe lost nothing but a lock of hair, which he could spare better then than he could now. For when I saw him here in New York a year ago, his crop was gone; he had nothing much left but a fringe, with a dome rising above.

About a year later I got *my* chance. But I was not hunting for it. Goodman went off to San Francisco for a week's holiday, and left me to be chief editor. I had supposed that that was an easy berth, there being nothing to do but write one editorial per day; but I was disappointed in that superstition. I couldn't find anything to write an article about, the first day. Then it occurred to me that inasmuch as it was the 22nd of April, 1864, the next morning would be the three-hundredth anniversary (1864.) of Shakespeare's birthday—and what better theme could I want than that? I got the Cyclopædia and examined it, and found out who Shakespeare was and what he had done, and I borrowed all that and laid it before a community that couldn't have been better prepared for instruction about Shakespeare than if they had been prepared by art. There wasn't enough of what Shakespeare had done to make an editorial of the necessary length, but I filled it out with what he hadn't done—which in many respects was more important and striking and readable than the handsomest things he had really accomplished. But next day I was in trouble again. There were no more Shakespeares to work up. There was nothing in past history, or in the world's future possibilities, to make an editorial out of, suitable to that community; so there was but one theme left. That theme was Mr. Laird, proprietor of the Virginia "Union." *His* editor had gone off to San Francisco too, and Laird was trying his hand at editing. I woke up Mr. Laird with some courtesies of the kind that were fashionable among newspaper editors in that region, and he came back at me the next day in a most vitriolic way. He was hurt by something I had said about him—some little thing —I don't remember what it was now — probably called him a horse-thief, or one of those little phrases customarily used to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

describe another editor. They were no doubt just, and accurate, but Laird was a very sensitive creature, and he didn't like it. So we expected a challenge from Mr. Laird, because according to the rules — according to the etiquette of duelling as reconstructed and reorganized and improved by the duellists of that region—whenever you said a thing about another person that he didn't like, it wasn't sufficient for him to talk back in the same offensive spirit: etiquette required him to send a challenge; so we waited for a challenge—waited all day. It didn't come. And as the day wore along, hour after hour, and no challenge came, the boys grew depressed. They lost heart. But I was cheerful; I felt better and better all the time. They couldn't understand it, but *I* could understand it. It was my *make* that enabled me to be cheerful when other people were despondent. So then it became necessary for us to waive etiquette and challenge Mr. Laird. When we reached that decision, they began to cheer up, but I began to lose some of my animation. However, in enterprises of this kind you are in the hands of your friends; there is nothing for you to do but to abide by what they consider to be the best course. Daggett wrote a challenge for me, for Daggett had the language — the right language — the convincing language—and I lacked it. Daggett poured out a stream of unsavory epithets upon Mr. Laird, charged with a vigor and venom of a strength calculated to persuade him; and Steve Gillis, my second, carried the challenge and came back to wait for the return. It didn't come. The boys were exasperated, but I kept my temper. Steve carried another challenge, hotter than the other, and we waited again. Nothing came of it. I began to feel quite comfortable. I began to take an interest in the challenges myself. I had not felt any before; but it seemed to me that I was accumulating a great and valuable reputation at no expense, and my delight in this grew and grew, as challenge after challenge was declined, until by midnight I was beginning to think that there was nothing in the world so much to be desired as a chance to fight a duel. So I hurried Daggett up; made him keep on sending challenge after challenge. Oh, well, I overdid it; Laird accepted. I might have known that that would happen—Laird was a man you couldn't depend on.

The boys were jubilant beyond expression. They helped me make my will, which was another discomfort—and I already had

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enough. Then they took me home. I didn't sleep any—didn't want to sleep. I had plenty of things to think about, and less than four hours to do it in—because five o'clock was the hour appointed for the tragedy, and I should have to use up one hour —beginning at four—in practising with the revolver and finding out which end of it to level at the adversary. At four we went down into a little gorge, about a mile from town, and borrowed a barn door for a mark—borrowed it of a man who was over in California on a visit—and we set the barn door up and stood a fence-rail up against the middle of it, to represent Mr. Laird. But the rail was no proper representative of him, for he was longer than a rail and thinner. Nothing would ever fetch him but a line shot, and then as like as not he would split the bullet—the worst material for duelling purposes that could be imagined. I began on the rail. I couldn't hit the rail; then I tried the barn door; but I couldn't hit the barn door. There was nobody in danger except stragglers around on the flanks of that mark. I was thoroughly discouraged, and I didn't cheer up any when we presently heard pistol-shots over in the next little ravine. I knew what that was—that was Laird's gang out practising him. They would hear my shots, and of course they would come up over the ridge to see what kind of a record I was making—see what their chances were against me. Well, I hadn't any record; and I knew that if Laird came over that ridge and saw my barn door without a scratch on it, he would be as anxious to fight as I was—or as I had been at midnight, before that disastrous acceptance came.

Now just at this moment, a little bird, no bigger than a sparrow, flew along by and lit on a sage-bush about thirty yards away. Steve whipped out his revolver and shot its head off. Oh, he was a marksman—much better than I was. We ran down there to pick up the bird, and just then, sure enough, Mr. Laird and his people came over the ridge, and they joined us. And when Laird's second saw that bird, with its head shot off, he lost color, he faded, and you could see that he was interested. He said:

"Who did that?"

Before I could answer, Steve spoke up and said quite calmly, and in a matter-of-fact way,

"Clemens did it."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The second said, "Why, that is wonderful. How far off was that bird?"

Steve said, "Oh, not far—about thirty yards."

The second said, "Well, that is astonishing shooting. How often can he do that?"

Steve said languidly, "Oh, about four times out of five."

I knew the little rascal was lying, but I didn't say anything. The second said, "Why, that is *amazing* shooting; I supposed he couldn't hit a church."

He was supposing very sagaciously, but I didn't say anything. Well, they said good morning. The second took Mr. Laird home, a little tottery on his legs, and Laird sent back a note in his own hand declining to fight a duel with me on any terms whatever.

Well, my life was saved—saved by that accident. I don't know what the bird thought about that interposition of Providence, but I felt very, very comfortable over it—satisfied and content. Now, we found out, later, that Laird had *hit* his mark four times out of six, right along. If the duel had come off, he would have so filled my skin with bullet-holes that it wouldn't have held my principles.

By breakfast-time the news was all over town that I had sent a challenge and Steve Gillis had carried it. Now that would entitle us to two years apiece in the penitentiary, according to the brand-new law. Judge North sent us no message as coming from himself, but a message *came* from a close friend of his. He said it would be a good idea for us to leave the territory by the first stage-coach. This would sail next morning, at four o'clock—and in the meantime we would be searched for, but not with avidity; and if we were in the Territory after that stage-coach left, we would be the first victims of the new law. Judge North was anxious to have some object-lessons for that law, and he would absolutely keep us in the prison the full two years.

Well, it seemed to me that our society was no longer desirable in Nevada; so we stayed in our quarters and observed proper caution all day—except that once Steve went over to the hotel to attend to another customer of mine. That was a Mr. Cutler. You see Laird was not the only person whom I had tried to reform during my occupancy of the editorial chair. I had looked around and selected several other people, and delivered a new zest of life into them through warm criticism and disapproval

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—so that when I laid down my editorial pen I had four horse-whippings and two duels owing to me. We didn't care for the horse-whippings; there was no glory in them; they were not worth the trouble of collecting. But honor required that some notice should be taken of that other duel. Mr. Cutler had come up from Carson City, and had sent a man over with a challenge from the hotel. Steve went over to pacify him. Steve weighed only ninety-five pounds, but it was well known throughout the territory that with his fists he could whip anybody that walked on two legs, let his weight and science be what they might. Steve was a Gillis, and when a Gillis confronted a man and had a proposition to make, the proposition always contained business. When Cutler found that Steve was my second he cooled down; he became calm and rational, and was ready to listen. Steve gave him fifteen minutes to get out of the hotel, and half an hour to get out of town or there would be results. So *that* duel went off successfully, because Mr. Cutler immediately left for Carson a convinced and reformed man.

I have never had anything to do with duels since. I thoroughly disapprove of duels. I consider them unwise, and I know they are dangerous. Also, sinful. If a man should challenge me now, I would go to that man and take him kindly and forgivingly by the hand and lead him to a quiet retired spot, and *kill* him.

MARK TWAIN.

(To be Continued.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AMERICAN SCHOOLS AND JAPANESE PUPILS.

BY C. W. FULTON, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM OREGON.

THE principal, if not the sole, cause that has led up to the exclusion of Japanese from the public schools of San Francisco provided for white children is the fact that those seeking admission to these schools were very largely adults, who, because they were beginners, necessarily entered the primary grades and were in consequence brought into intimate association with the young white children of those grades. The serious objections to such a condition are manifest. Hence the Japanese were relegated to the schools originally designed and established for Chinese. It is not improbable that the authorities experienced less embarrassment in reaching a determination to exclude the Japanese from association with the whites in the public schools than they would have suffered had circumstances seemed to make it expedient for them to take similar action regarding any one of the European races; for it must be admitted that, while the Japanese in the aggregate, as a nation, are admired for their wonderful pluck, energy and marvellous progress of late years, the individual Japanese, as we see and know him on the Pacific Coast, is not a favorite with our people. It is the old anti-Chinese spirit revived, directed against the Japanese coolie class, and intensified by certain objectionable traits of character in the Japanese which are not found in the Chinaman. Still, were it not for the fact that adult Japanese largely flocked to the primary grades of the schools attended by white children, the order of exclusion would probably never have been demanded by any considerable number of people. For over a quarter of a century Chinese children have attended the Oregon public schools, without protest on the part of any of our citizens to my knowledge. I am very certain, however, that should adult Chinamen or Japanese seek admis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sion to the primary grades, very numerous and emphatic protests would be heard. I cannot believe the result would be otherwise in any community.

In addition to adequate facilities provided for them in special schools in conjunction with Chinese, there are numerous private schools in every part of the country which the Japanese can attend, and there has never been any objection to admitting them to our colleges and universities. It must, therefore, be apparent that no really just cause for complaint exists. In truth, the action of the San Francisco authorities would be a matter of little moment or concern to the general public but for the protest of the Japanese Government. The issue between a few Japanese residents of California and the School Board of San Francisco was thereby elevated to the dignity of a grave international question; and some are now so pessimistic as to predict the possibility, even probability, of war as the outcome. Such a result is impossible and such predictions are absurd.

The question will be taken up, considered and determined in that spirit of frankness and sincerity which the cordial relations existing between the two nations insure. The determination will be just and honorable to both. The United States Government will not seek to avoid any obligation it has actually assumed.

Whatever misunderstanding exists is doubtless due to the absence on the part of the Government of Japan of a clear comprehension of our somewhat complex governmental system. It is probably not understood by them that the establishment and maintenance of our public schools, and the direction and control thereof, are matters committed to, and wholly within the jurisdiction of, the local State governments, and that the Federal Government contributes nothing towards their support and is in no wise responsible for the manner in which they are conducted.

The public school is an important element in the social life of every American community. The system is provided by the State, and each community establishes and maintains its own schools thereunder. Can the Federal Government, in the exercise of the treaty-making power which is vested in it exclusively, invade the, at least otherwise, exclusive power of a State to control and regulate its school system? The question is one of great importance. I shall not attempt here to discuss it fully. Under our system, the States do not derive their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

powers from the General Government. On the contrary, it is expressly stated in the Federal Constitution that all powers not therein delegated to the United States, or prohibited to the States, are reserved to the States respectively. The power to provide a system of education is not delegated to the General Government nor prohibited to the States. It would appear, therefore, to be one of the powers reserved to the latter.

It is contended, however, that a public treaty is the supreme law of the land, and that, when any of its provisions conflict with a statute or constitution of a State, the stipulations of the treaty must prevail. That is true only on the assumption that the provisions of the treaty are such as the United States Government may, under the Constitution of the United States, authoritatively assent to. Can the Federal Government by treaty stipulations annul or modify State statutes that it could not by legislation constitutionally disturb? That it may do so in some cases must, I think, be conceded. For instance, it has been held to be within the power of the United States to remove by treaty the disability of aliens to inherit real estates within the several States. In Geofroy *vs.* Riggs (133 U. S., 266), Mr. Justice Field said:

> "The treaty power, as expressed in the Constitution, is in terms unlimited, except by those restraints which are found in that instrument against the action of the Government or of its departments, and those arising from the nature of the Government itself and of that of the States. It does not extend so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids, or a change in the character of the Government or in that of one of the States. But, with these exceptions, there is no limit to the questions which can be adjusted touching any matter which is properly the subject of negotiations with a foreign country."

It has been held, however, that "an attempt on the part of the United States, by compact with a foreign Government, to qualify the right of suffrage in a State, prescribe the times and mode of elections or to restrain the power of taxation under State authority, would transcend the limits of the treaty-making power and be entirely void" (Pierce *vs.* State, 13 N. H., 576). Will it be contended that the United States may, by treaty, confer on alien residents of a State the right to vote? Some States permit certain alien residents to exercise the elective franchise. Will it be contended that, under the "most-favored nation" clause, inserted in most treaties, all resident aliens in such States may

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lawfully demand that right? If, by treaty, the Federal Government may confer on alien parents the right to send their children to the public schools of a State, why may it not by the same instrument secure to the parents the right to vote at school elections? Why not secure to them the right to official position under the State governments? Undoubtedly, by treaty, all rights necessary to the enjoyment of life and liberty, the acquisition, enjoyment and disposal of property may be guaranteed; but, clearly, the police of the several States is not a subject-matter to which the treaty-making power extends. Hence, the power to conduct its schools in its own way, to prescribe the qualifications necessary to admission thereto and to exclude all persons whose admittance would, in its judgment, prove detrimental to the public welfare, must, I think, be held to be a power vested exclusively in each of the States, respectively, and one which the Federal Government cannot, even by treaty, invade or annul. Happily, the treaty between the United States and Japan does not in terms propose any such invasion, and cannot, in my judgment, by any reasonable construction be made to imply any such purpose.

C. W. FULTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE RÔLE OF AUSTRIA IN EUROPEAN POLICY.

BY DEMETRIUS C. BOULGER.

THE retirement of Count Goluchowski from the post of Minister of Foreign Affairs in Austria, which he had held for nearly twelve years, may mark the beginning of a new epoch in the policy of that Empire. I intend no disrespect for the sentiment of Hungarians in omitting the name of their country from the title of this article. Moreover, in that great and interesting state, whose name ever reminds us that it was the eastern bulwark against the barbarians, national must play a subordinate part to dynastic policy, although the latter has necessarily to be moulded and modified by the law of state safety. The policy of the peoples of the most conglomerate country in Europe has been and must continue to be mainly the policy of the House of Hapsburg. What that policy is, and what are the means available to enforce it, do not seem to have entered sufficiently into the calculations, based exclusively on national aspirations and grievances, of those writers with whom the coming disintegration of Austria-Hungary is the favorite bogey. The present is not an inappropriate time for placing before the reader some views very different from those generally expressed by persons who are too fond of pronouncing a requiem over the dominion of the hereditary representatives of Charlemagne. It is, indeed, none too soon to correct the hastily formed opinions which represent that Austria has become an expiring entity and influence, at the very moment when the key to the European situation is to be found in Vienna, and when Austria will probably exercise the deciding vote in the next European *bouleversement*.

Forty years have now elapsed since Austria, attacked on two sides, resigned, after a brief but not inglorious struggle, the first

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

place in Germany to her old rival Prussia. The question whether that resignation was final and beyond reconsideration has lost none of its interest because it has remained in abeyance for over a generation. In referring to the epoch that is now closing, it is sufficient to record the fact that the blow to Austria's premiership was due to the grave error of Napoleon III, who, by philandering with impossible schemes of aggrandizement in the Netherlands, made himself the tool of Prussian policy, of which he was himself marked out to be the next victim. Some writers have said that Austria repeated in 1870 the French blunder of 1866; but Austria's hands were tied by the military conventions Prussia concluded in 1868 with the South German States, who engaged to support their old enemy. To have entered upon a war with them, her ancient allies, her undoubted sympathizers not less now than then, would have been fratricidal on the part of Austria. She had no choice but to stand aloof, to feign, if she did not feel, sympathy with her recent conqueror, and to accept for a time all the consequences of Prussia's double triumph. Among those consequences not the most agreeable was a fixed subordinate place in the political partnership, known as the Triple Alliance, with the two states that had despoiled her.

During this long period of self-effacement Austria has been ruled by a monarch who is endowed with the qualities that grace adversity, and lend to misfortune the redeeming touch of dignity. The most suspicious chief of the Berlin Foreign Office would never have imputed to the Emperor Francis Joseph any ambitious counter-scheming, or sinister longing to redress the hitherto unequal balance of fortune; nor could any likely successor to Kaunitz or Beust be detected among the Directors of the Ministerium on the Ballhaus platz, who might be classed under the uniform designation of "men of buckram." They may be supposed to have taken to heart Count Beust's phrase after Sedan, "*Il n'y a plus d'Europe,*" and made it their motto. It may be admitted that no other policy save that of temporizing and waiting on events would have been prudent, or even possible, for Austria after the overthrow of France in 1870. To have attempted the adventurous policy of competing with Prussia on the old lines would only have been to play the game of Russia and to facilitate the attainment of the Pan-German programme. Austrian opposition to Prussia would also have kept Italy firmly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

attached to the northern Power, which would have purchased her allegiance by concessions in the Trentino and on the Adriatic. Austria's policy during these last thirty-six years, whether by some instinctive astuteness or happy accident, has thus been the best that could possibly have been followed, while Time has been fighting her battle in a manner that no one yet seems to perceive.

The course of events has freed Austria from all apprehension on the side of Russia, whilst at the same time Hungary has shaken off that antipathy (not unmixed with horror born of the events of 1849) to the Russians which was the uppermost passion of the nation. The Prussian sympathies of the Magyars, which were much talked about and somewhat paraded in the time of Julius Andrassy, have also vanished. In their place has sprung up an anti-German feeling, beside which the old hatred of Russia seems insignificant. Skilfully utilized, that sentiment may yet save the Hapsburg dynasty, as it did in the time of Maria Theresa, and avert the Prussianizing of Austria already predicted by the Pan-Germans.

But the change on the western frontier has not been less remarkable than on the eastern. For some years past Italy has been reverting to the natural union with France, and moving away more rapidly than could have been anticipated from the artificial arrangement with North and South Germany. Of course, the most apparent indication of this tendency is the so-called feud with Austria about the Trentino, and certainly Berlin journalists do not neglect any opportunity of magnifying this trouble; but the most obvious is not always the most important; and cabinets sometimes shape their course by other agencies than those of popular passion. What has to be noted is that Italy is being alienated from Prussia. In any trial of strength between Hapsburg and Hohenzollern, there would be no probability of Italy's joining Prussia as she did on the last memorable occasion. Berlin could not offer the old bribes, or at least only in diminished form, while Italian statesmen cannot but reflect that a Pan-Germania planted on the Adriatic would aggravate the existing situation, and double-lock a door which is at present only partially closed. They may well exclaim, when closer bonds are proposed with Prussia, "*Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes.*" Leaving aside Austro-Italian controversies, which are not very serious, and which are treated with calmness by their respective

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

statesmen, the fact remains that Austria, freed from anxiety on the east, has no reason to anticipate attack from the west whenever she may decide to make her effort to assert the complete independence of her policy, which has for so long been the mere reflection of that devised at and dictated from Berlin.

The moment for making this manifestation cannot be far distant. Austria, freed of the Netherlands and the Italian duchies, has no cause of quarrel with France. The Triple Alliance was to give her security against Russia, and in her confiding trust Austria believed that it did give her security under every circumstance, until Bismarck startled her with the revelation of his Insurance Treaty with Russia. The course of events has now rendered any guarantee of security against Russia no longer necessary. Hence it follows that Austria derives no more advantage than Italy out of the Triple Alliance. It might be objected that the Germans of central Europe may yet have to combine against future dangers from various quarters, but then Austria is not exclusively German. The shouldering up of the Germans in the Dual Monarchy means the shouldering out of the non-Germans, and the voluntary abdication of Austria's separate and legitimate policy follows as a matter of course. As the House of Hapsburg is very far from being *in extremis,* and is indeed likely to display an unsuspected staying power, it is clear that Austrian policy can never be exclusively and rigidly German, according to those who dream in the couplets of "*Was ist das Deutsche Vaterland?*" The scares created at Berlin have failed to widen the breach between Austria and Italy; the demonstrations of a few students and irredentists have not prevented the statesmen of the two countries from realizing that the *status quo* has great advantages for both, and that it would be folly to create complications in the Balkan peninsula or elsewhere. Italy has practically recovered her freedom of action, and there is little doubt that very shortly Austria will show that she holds the same view about herself. She will resent being any longer a shadow or a satellite; the "men of buckram," who were very useful for a mere show during a period of *recueillement,* will be superseded by men of action who can look to all points of the horizon, and guide the bark of state into what may be termed the main current of European policy and sentiment. When they seek to do this, they cannot avoid being struck by the resemblance between the Euro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pean situation of to-day and that in 1756 on the eve of the Seven Years' War. There is, of course, one material difference. The resources of England are no longer available for Prussia.

If the time is not far off for a revision and recasting of Austria's external policy, the present moment is not a whit too soon to ask for the display of calmer judgment and more reticence on the part of outside observers in discussing the internal affairs of the Dual Empire. The Hungarians are a brave, emotional people, who are not to be governed by the methods that Berlin applies to the Herreros; but their political sagacity in detecting that now or never is the time to make a stand against the irruption of Pan-Germanism south of the Erz-Gebirge will no longer be seriously disputed. While some people within the Austrian dominions have been saying that the Hungarian demand for the use of their language in the army is treasonable—and it is most instructive to watch how the press of Berlin and the papers of Vienna subsidized by Berlin descanted on that theme, until their readers must have grown weary and pined for novelty—a great many more people there have perceived that Hungary is giving Austria a political lesson of the very deepest significance, and one, moreover, which she is already taking to heart. What is that lesson? It is that a rigidly German policy on the lines laid down at Berlin is not a policy that Austria can or must long pursue. Hungary is telling her elder sister, in no uncertain terms, that the time has arrived when this misfitting garment should be laid aside. A worthy and wise Austrian policy should never be shaped on models supplied from Berlin, and Austrians and Hungarians are not likely to fly at each other's throats because the gentle Germans suggest that dragonades are the remedy for what they are pleased to call Hungarian "disaffection." This disaffection is nothing more than the first open manifestation of the growing resentment at the patronage that Prussia and the Hohenzollerns have long extended over Austria and the Hapsburgs.

But, it may be asked, what about the terrible agitation and commotion going on in Hungary, as described by so many correspondents at Vienna and Buda-Pesth? Scarcely a newspaper exists that does not put this problem constantly before its readers. Is not a fratricidal struggle imminent in Hungary, and will not the long-anticipated disruption of the Dual Empire follow on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"the disappearance of the Emperor Francis Joseph"? The question is not merely asked; it is answered in the same breath with an unqualified affirmative. These commentators omit to take into their reckoning the undeniable fact that what is called by some the excessive loyalty of the Emperor Francis Joseph to his Prussian partner is one of the chief irritating causes that lie at the root of the recent demonstrations by the Hungarian people, which are in a way the proof of their political intelligence. This being so, it follows that "the disappearance of the Emperor Francis Joseph"—which implies no disparagement of that great and good man, but is used here merely as a quotation from the obtrusive and offensive requiems on the Hapsburg dynasty already referred to — would not entail the serious consequences alleged, provided that his successor adopted the counter-policy of that embodied in the Triple Alliance. The present Emperor is to be regarded as struggling, out of pure loyalty, against any change in Austrian policy. But the fates are inexorable, the hour-glass telling off the period during which Austria was compelled to be tied to the train of her ancient rival has almost run down, and no timidity can avail to keep that Empire much longer under the trammels of German policy, which is antipathetic to so many Austrian interests, and even incompatible with her existence as a Great Power. What Austria has to fear is not the display of vivacity and energy by any of her component races, but the enervating influence and asphyxiating pressure of her false friend on the Spree.

Still, the situation renders it desirable that something should be done to satisfy the Hungarians that no attempt will be made to Germanize their country, and to convince them that the House of Hapsburg still relies on their loyalty as one of the chief props of its power and stability. If this is quickly done, the response will come in the same sure tones as were heard in 1742 to the appeal of Maria Theresa. But the people who describe the Hungarians as unreasonable, and who call them the Irish of the Dual Empire, are asserting that the Emperor can make no further concessions, and that he must now stand firm, which in their minds means the adoption of German methods. If those who hold these opinions were the only mentors of the Hofburg, things beyond the Leitha might be painted in dark colors; but those who declare that the Emperor Francis Joseph has exhausted his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

patience or his forbearance towards any of his subjects cannot have read the story of his long and sad life with any care. If he thought them entirely in the wrong, his correction would still be one of paternal gentleness; if reflection has made him see that they are not wholly wrong, because the deeper cause of a disturbed national instinct lies at the root of what might at first be deemed trivial grievances, then we may be sure that the concession will be proportionate with the chastened judgment of a large-souled man.

Austria's need for the moment is not merely a new policy but new men. The talents that are useful for a period of inaction, when to "mark time" is the wisest course, are not those that will achieve success when important decisions have to be made, and fortitude and the courage that takes one's fate in both hands are the qualities needed. The Emperor Francis Joseph is showing, by his acceptance of Count Goluchowski's resignation, that he feels the need of new advisers, chiefly because of the deep-rooted repugnance in one part of his dominions to the foreign policy of the Empire. If a different turn were given to that policy, it is almost certain that many current apprehensions would be allayed, and that alone would entail a diminution in the agitation and excitement of which so much is being said and written. The pure Austrians have for years had little or nothing to do with the higher direction of affairs, which have been left mainly in the hands of Poles, Czechs and Slavs. The Hungarians also have not had their due share in the direction of the Imperial policy in external affairs. Yet there are good reasons for thinking that the Kaunitz of the twentieth century will spring from their ranks.

Before the inspired statesman who will nationalize Austrian policy and purge it of its spurious Teutonism is likely to reveal himself, the work for which he is wanted must become more or less defined and apparent. What is needed in Austria is some rallying-cry to which all its federated nationalities will respond. This will arise when some common peril that can only be met by closer union and a serried front presents itself. The first step in the right direction, however, will have been taken when something has been done to satisfy the Hungarians that no attempt is being or will be made to Germanize them. Even with regard to the language question in the army, some *via media*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

might easily be found. Military efficiency must be the main object with Hungarians as with Austrians, but some concessions are quite within the range of practical politics. For instance, the Hungarian regiments could be taught the phrases of command, which are of a very limited number, between twenty and thirty sentences altogether, in German as well as in Hungarian, and allowed to use their own tongue on their own soil. Even then the Austro-Hungarian army would not be the only bilingual force in Europe. The Flemish regiments in Belgium are commanded in their own language and the Walloon in French. However excessive the Hungarian agitation may appear at a distance, it is clear that the ultra-Germanism of some of the Emperor's advisers has led him sometimes to sanction too uncompromising a rejection of Hungarian requests, which might have been granted to a partial extent, and at the same time deprived of half their mischief, if indeed there were anything mischievous in them at all. The unqualified denial of such requests in the first place, followed by minatory articles in the pro-Berlin Vienna press, led many Hungarians to attach sinister importance to the report this summer that the Emperor William was anxious to play at their expense the same part that Russia had played in 1849.

Although Austria has never swerved in her adherence to the Triple Alliance, and the absolute fidelity with which she supported Prussia at Algeciras is still quite fresh in the memory, there have been indications for some time that she was making collateral arrangements of considerable importance on her own account. During the last six or seven years her diplomacy has been most active at St. Petersburg, where an excellent understanding with Russia on all points has been arrived at, and its value has been enormously increased by the fact that it has not been regarded with either suspicion or dislike in Hungary. People have made the Prussian diplomatist, like the Prussian drill-sergeant, a kind of brass god, but they are really both very clumsy persons, and at Buda-Pesth a juster view has been taken of the true value of the Austro-Russian *entente* than has prevailed at Berlin. The creator of this friendly understanding, which precludes a quarrel in either Poland or the Balkans, was Baron von Aehrenthal, and he is now at the head of Austria's foreign department as Count Goluchowski's successor. He is, therefore, the originator and executant of the first piece of origi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nal statesmanship in Austria's foreign policy since Count Beust, and it will be very surprising if he does not endeavor to crown his work by further successes in quarters which would readily respond to any Austrian advances. An *entente* with Russia might easily be supplemented by assurances which would satisfy Italy that there is no desire or intention of offering provocation to her somewhat oversensitive feelings. Austria and Italy are partners in an alliance which is nominally pacific and non-aggressive. With England and France there is not the smallest difference to ruffle the temper, or cloud the sky, and cordial friendship may be said either to exist or to be obtainable for the asking. An Austrian statesman who surveys the international situation calmly and without prejudice will see in all these circumstances ground for confidence and even complacency. The day when Austria might have been coerced into doing what she did not wish and ought not to do has passed by. If her statesmen realize the significance of what is happening in Europe and show themselves equal to their task, they will before long make their country respected by all, while they will have the satisfaction of seeing it menaced by none, because they will have ranged themselves on the side of Europe, which the triumph of Prussia in 1866 and 1870 effaced, as Count Beust said, but fortunately only for a generation.

The rôle of Austria in Europe should be a moderating one; but as long as her political action was known to depend solely on the wishes of Berlin, it was, quite unintentionally, we may admit, but still none the less positively, an inflammatory influence, for the Prussian Government, while it felt sure of Austrian cooperation, has often thought of defying the rest of Europe and trying to establish its hegemony down to the English Channel. Many North Germans, indeed, consider that Prussian policy has committed its most serious blunder in allowing the favorable moment for confirming the 1870 triumph to pass away unutilized. Although only a few months have elapsed since Algeciras, which marked the apogee in the friendly relations between Austria and Prussia, the confidence felt at Berlin as to the absolute subserviency of Austria to its wishes and orders is shaken, and the appointment of Baron von Aehrenthal will further diminish it. It is beginning to be realized there that Austrian devotion and self-sacrifice was a personal offering on the altar of blighted

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hopes and harsh experience by the Emperor Francis Joseph, and not the full and unchanging surrender of their interests and ideals by the Austro-Hungarian peoples to their old antagonist. The next phase in the evolution of Austrian policy *vis à vis* to its powerful neighbor will be when Berlin finds itself compelled to listen to counsels of moderation from Vienna.

And thus there will be a fresh exemplification, in the very heart of old Europe, of the truth of the aphorism that the whirligig of time brings its own revenges. The Austria that was trampled on forty years ago, and that has played ever since a timid and retiring part in the great game of world politics, is once more coming to the front. It will, perhaps, not be very long before Vienna is again as conspicuous a centre of European diplomacy as it was in the days of Metternich. The objects of its statesmen will long continue to be pacific, because their country has need of consolidation; but they would be more than human if, remembering all the past, they did not feel a peculiar satisfaction in the knowledge that the course of events had placed in their hands the means of curbing the arrogance of Prussia.

DEMETRIUS C. BOULGER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE UNITED STATES CAN ENFORCE ITS LAW.

BY ANTI-FEDERALIST.

In view of recent threatened assaults upon the sovereignty of the States it seems to the writer of this article to be well to explain that he is opposed to them, and that he regards them as proposed violations of the fundamental law of the country. The excuse for this intrusion of his personal views is that the following argument is in behalf of a stronger and a farther-reaching enforcement of the true Federal power than has yet been undertaken by any President except Grover Cleveland. It is not because the Federal Government ought to usurp the customary and usual functions of the States that, in this contention, it is to be urged to force its rightful power within States and within and against their local and municipal agencies. To intrude with the Federal power into a State, or into the States, is bad; it is quite as bad, and much meaner, to decline to enforce the Federal power, the acknowledged and unassailable power of the United States, because of fear of a popular prejudice that may find expression in the popular vote. It is true, indeed, that this declination of right may be due to ignorance, just as encroachments upon the States may be due to incapacity to comprehend the nature and the value of our dual form of government. Whosoever would make this defence is welcome to his plea. The true statement of the respective powers of the two elements of this government is made in the following sentence of Cooley's "Principles of Constitutional Law":

"In American constitutional law a peculiar system is established; the powers of sovereignty being classified, and some of them apportioned to the Government of the United States for its exercise, while others are left with the States. Under this apportionment, the nation is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

possessed of supreme, absolute and uncontrollable power, in respect to certain subjects throughout all the States, while the States have the like unqualified power, within their respective limits, in respect to other subjects."

This doctrine has been held and applied in many cases by the Supreme Court since its earliest days; and, in some of these cases, it was early necessary to lay down the rule that, in exercising its rightful power, the Federal Government can know nothing of State lines. Acting within its jurisdiction, it is "supreme, absolute and uncontrollable." Within the State itself, and notwithstanding the State, it possesses the coercive power to carry out its lawful commands, to defend its citizens, to protect its majesty, and to enforce against State or local opposition rights which are its own or which it has constitutionally granted to others, citizens or foreigners, individuals or nations.

The Supreme Court has established this doctrine, which, as announced by the judges, is as much part of the Federal Constitution as if it had been written there in unmistakable terms. If the power which belongs by right to the United States has not been exercised, if wrong has been suffered in consequence of the failure of the Federal Government to exert acknowledged power, if shifty evasions have been resorted to in order to avoid legal responsibility, the dereliction of duty is chargeable to the political departments of the Government, to the legislative and executive departments. The judicial department has done its full duty, and doubtless is ready again to do it whenever the occasion may arise.

The particular subject now under consideration relates to the power of the Federal Government to enforce the provisions of one of its treaties against a State or local government. This treaty is that of 1894 with Japan. The Japanese Government, if we are to accept the uncontradicted statements of the newspapers, through its Ambassador at Washington, asserts that the treaty has been violated by the so-called exclusion of Japanese children from the public schools of San Francisco. It is doubtful if such a contention could be justly maintained; for, while the treaty gives to Japanese in this country all of certain "privileges, liberties and rights" enjoyed by native citizens, or by citizens or subjects "of the most-favored nation," it does not follow that this particular grant by the nation carries the right

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to attend the same State schools as are open to native and foreign white children. For the purposes of the argument, however, this issue may be considered as of no avail by reason of the admissions of the Federal Government. For some unexplained reason it has been deemed wise at Washington to admit the truth and justice of the Japanese representations. Therefore, in a nutshell, the case is this: The United States, by the treaty of 1894, agreed that the children of Japanese residing in this country should have the same right to attend the public schools as is enjoyed by the children of white natives; that this includes the right to attend the public schools of a State, therefore of the State of California; that it is, furthermore, a grant of the right that Japanese children may attend the same schools as those which white children lawfully and habitually attend; that, contrary to this promise of the treaty, the Board of Education of the city of San Francisco issued an order excluding Japanese children from schools which they had the right to attend; that thus a treaty of the United States has been violated by the Board of Education of San Francisco. The Japanese Government looks to the United States to repair the wrong, and possibly to make amends, and to punish the offenders. The attitude of the Government of the United States has been, at the best, one of uncertainty. It has asserted, at the most, that it does not know whether it possesses the power to prevent a breach of its own treaty by its own citizens, even when those citizens are members of a governing, or political, body. It is not the first time that the issue has arisen.

Since the power to make treaties has been given to the United States and denied to the States, and since the Federal Constitution has made a treaty the "supreme law of the land," one of two conclusions must follow: either the Government may compel obedience to its treaties, and punish disobedience; or, so far as its foreign relations are concerned, it is impotent. But so far as the law alone can make the Government powerful, this Government is far from being thus impotent. In the case of Ware *vs.* Hylton, and in many other cases, it has been decided by the Supreme Court that a law of a State must yield to the "supreme law of the land," whether that supreme law be expressed in a provision of the Constitution, or in a statute passed by Congress, or in a treaty. This doctrine was laid down, by both

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Congress and the States, with reference to the duty of the States to carry out certain provisions of the treaty of peace of 1783 with Great Britain. The action of the States was, at first, not unlike the present action of San Francisco. They did not propose to abide by the agreement that the debts due to British debtors should be paid. In some instances they pretended, or asserted, that their conduct in reviving old confiscation laws, or in enforcing existing statutes, was impelled by the failure of the English Government to keep its agreement to vacate certain ports which it continued to hold. This was an impudent assumption on the part of the States of the right to take an action which, if it were to be taken at all, was wholly and solely within the discretion and power of the United States. And yet, even in making this unwarranted assumption, the States and Congress agreed that the treaty superseded all States' laws antagonistic to it. In Rhode Island, Connecticut and Pennsylvania, the courts held this doctrine. Under the law of Maryland, one who owed a debt to a British subject was compelled by law to pay it into the State Treasury. In an action for debt brought under the treaty, the court held that the treaty repealed this State law, not only for the future, but for the past. It was decreed that the defendant debtor should pay the debt to the British creditor, notwithstanding his previous payment into the State Treasury. In the State of New York, the Legislature undertook to revive an old law concerning the renting of land under military order during the British occupation of the city. In a suit to recover rent, the treaty of peace was pleaded, and the court held that the treaty prevailed in opposition to the law of the State. In Georgia, a judge charged the Grand Jury that the Constitution, the laws and the treaties of the United States were paramount over the State constitutions and laws, while another judge of the same State held that the treaty of peace repealed an act of the State.

Early in the nineteenth century the question reached the Supreme Court, a number of cases springing out of complications of title due to the change of ownership of Florida from Spain to the United States. In Ware *vs.* Hylton, Justice Chase, writing the opinion of the Court, said that a treaty is "paramount and controlling to all State laws and even to State constitutions wheresoever they interfere or disagree." In Foster *vs.* Neilson, a leading case, it was decided by the Supreme Court that a law

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the United States, *i. e.*, a statute of Congress, must yield to a treaty of subsequent date. Chief-Justice Marshall, who delivered the court's opinion in this case, said:

> "Our Constitution declares a treaty to be the law of the land. It is, consequently, to be regarded in courts of justice as equivalent to an act of the legislature, whenever it operates of itself without the aid of any legislative provision."

Ten years before, in 1819, the Chief Justice, in McCulloch *vs.* Maryland, had said:

> "The Government of the United States, though limited in its powers, is supreme; and its laws, when made in pursuance of the Constitution, form the supreme law of the land, 'anything in the constitution or the laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.'"

In one respect the treaty-making power enjoys a distinction which the law-making power does not possess: it may accomplish by treaty what Congress may not do by statute because the Constitution has not granted the power to the law-making branch of the Government. Congress, for example, cannot enact a law permitting aliens to own land within a State, notwithstanding the laws of the State; indeed, it may not enact any law controlling, directing or limiting in any way the right to hold land within a State. A treaty, however, may give to aliens the right, as heirs or devisees, to sell land within a State and to take the proceeds. Under the State law, lands owned by an alien, who had died possessed of them, would escheat to the State. A treaty thus defeating the laws of the State has been sustained, and made effective, by the Supreme Court of the United States. The case of Hauenstein *vs.* Lynham, decided by the Supreme Court in 1879, arose out of such a state of facts as has been set forth. Samuel Hauenstein, a native of Switzerland, died in Richmond, Virginia, possessed of lands, without heirs who were citizens of this country. The State escheator took steps to obtain the land, but the Swiss heirs of Hauenstein, aliens, claimed the right to sell the land and to take the proceeds under a treaty between the United States and Switzerland made in 1850. This treaty gave to citizens of Switzerland the right to the proceeds of a sale, notwithstanding the law of Virginia, under which the State was entitled to the land. The court upheld the treaty against the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

State. The regularity of the treaty being sustained, Justice Swayne, speaking for the court, quoted the decision in Ware *vs.* Hylton, as follows:

"There can be no limitation on the power of the people of the United States. By their authority the State constitutions were made, and by their authority the Constitution of the United States was established; and they had the power to change or abolish the State constitutions or to make them yield to the General Government and to treaties made by their authority. A treaty cannot be *the supreme law of the land*, that is, of all the United States, if any act of a State legislature can stand in its way. If the constitution of a State (which is the fundamental law of the State and paramount to its legislature) must give way to a treaty and fall before it, can it be questioned whether the less power, an act of the State legislature, must not be prostrate? It is the declared will of the people of the United States that every treaty made by the authority of the United States shall be superior to the constitution and laws of any individual State, and their will alone is to decide. If a law of a State, contrary to a treaty, is not void, but voidable only, by a repeal or nullification by a State legislature, this certain consequence follows—that the will of a small part of the United States may control or defeat the will of the whole."

Since 1796, when the case of Ware *vs.* Hylton was decided, the Supreme Court has entertained no doubt as to the power of the United States to enforce its "supreme law." Why should there be any doubt anywhere? There is no power but that of the United States to deal for this nation with foreign nations, as Justice Gray said, in Fong Yue Ting *vs.* United States:

"The United States are a sovereign and independent nation, and are vested by the Constitution with the entire control of international relations, and with all the powers of government necessary to maintain that control and to make it effective. The only Government of this country which other nations recognize or treat with is the Government of the Union; and the only American flag known throughout the world is the flag of the United States."

Many times the doctrine laid down in 1796 has been stated by the Supreme Court. In 1819, in McCulloch *vs.* Maryland, Chief-Justice Marshall declared it as, in 1816, Justice Story had stated it in Martin *vs.* Hunter's Lessee. In the latter case, Justice Story asserted that the "courts of the United States can without question revise the proceedings of the executive and legislative authorities of the States."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is well-recognized doctrine that Federal laws which are constitutional, *i. e.*, made "in pursuance" of the Constitution, and "all treaties made . . . under the authority of the United States" have the force of the Constitution itself, and any State statute, or any provision of a State constitution, which is repugnant to the Federal Constitution, or to a Federal statute, or to a Federal treaty, is void. This means that any act of a State authority, executive or legislative, or any order of a local board, as in this Japanese controversy, which is contrary to a "supreme law of the land"—Constitution, statute or treaty—may be declared void by the courts of the United States.

Under the decisions of the Supreme Court, then, a State cannot make a law, or perform an act—nor can any of its local governing bodies, of course—which is repugnant to a provision of the Federal Constitution, or to one of its statutes, or to one of its treaties, without being guilty of a violation of the supreme Federal law. If an individual be sued under such an act in a civil action, he may plead that the State law is repugnant to the Federal Constitution or statute or treaty. If the State court decides against this plea, the injured party may appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States. If the State seek to punish him for an offence against this same law, in a criminal action, the accused may obtain his release on *habeas corpus* on the ground that the State law under which he is prosecuted is contrary to the supreme Federal law. The case under consideration arises from the action of the Board of Education of San Francisco. This action is admitted by the United States authorities to be repugnant to a treaty between the United States and Japan, and is, therefore, an offence against the supreme law of the land. It seems to be generally admitted, at least it is the general impression, and it has been asserted by several Secretaries of State, that the United States cannot enforce this supreme law against a State, or a city, or any local power, nor can it punish the members of a mob who have been guilty of a crime, of murder, for example, thus offending against the "supreme law" of the United States.

If this position be well taken, it involves a confession of such impotence on the part of the United States as deprives the country of the right to assert itself to be a "World Power." Indeed, if this contention be sound, the Federal Government is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a second-rate domestic power. If it be true, why need the States take notice of the judgments of its courts, or of the statutes of its Congress, or of the Federal Constitution itself? Let us suppose, for example, that the defendant in a civil action brought and pursued in a State's courts, pleads that the State law under which he is sued violates the obligation of a contract, a kind of law which a State is prohibited from passing by the Constitution of the United States. Notwithstanding his plea, he is defeated by the highest tribunal of the State, his constitutional contention being decided against him. Declaring that the State has deprived him of a right which is his under the Federal Constitution, the United States Supreme Court gives him a writ of error, removes the case to its jurisdiction, and decides that his contention is well founded; that the law of the State is void because it violates the obligation of a contract, and is, therefore, repugnant to the Constitution. Let us assume that the State ignores the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States; that an execution issues on the judgment of the State court; and that the alleged debtor's property is seized and sold, notwithstanding the decision of the United States Supreme Court. Cannot the United States protect its citizen effectually? Having declared that he shall not be pursued under the State law, is the United States Government so impotent that it is unable to protect him against the assumed illegal act of the State, or of any officer or board of officers within the State? If an accused is convicted and sentenced under a law which he declares to be an *ex post facto* law, a law which the Federal Constitution forbids a State to enact, and if, on application to the United States courts for a writ of *habeas corpus,* the Supreme Court decides that he is right, may the State authorities nevertheless execute him with impunity? Is there no power in the United States to take from the State jailer or the State executioner the victim whom its own courts have declared innocent of the crime with which he has been charged?

Are not these assumptions fair illustrations of the case of the offenders against the "supreme law of the land," formulated in the treaty with Japan? Just as the State authorities might refuse to obey the Federal law as announced by the Supreme Court, so the Board of Education of San Francisco refuses to obey the law as set forth in the treaty. In either case, we have disobe-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dience by local authorities to the law of the United States. In the instances which have been mentioned, the Government and the country would insist upon obedience to the law, and the State authorities who nullified the law would be considered to be rebels. It has been settled by war that a State may not nullify a legislative act of the Federal Government; and if a State may not do this, it may not nullify a treaty. There is no difference in degree between a statute and a treaty, between the two kinds of the supreme law.

As Chief-Justice Marshall said, a treaty is equivalent to a statute, and it has been decided by the Supreme Court more than once that they are of like effect; that a treaty may be repealed by a subsequent statute, and a statute may be repealed by a subsequent treaty.

Each, when it is operative, is the effective supreme law of the land.

There is, indeed, no such impotence in law as has been admitted by the political power. For some reason not entirely clear, although a shrewd conjecture may be made, it has been assumed that the United States cannot enforce its law against the hostile action of a State. It may be the policy of politics to take this view; it may be for the interests of a party to contend that the United States cannot compel the observance of its laws and treaties, and cannot punish those who offend against them. But the judges have not argued thus, nor have all Presidents acted on such a policy of timidity. In 1894 the Chicago rioters, under the lead of Eugene V. Debs, violated the law of the United States by interfering with the passage of the mails and obstructing interstate commerce. Mr. Cleveland and Attorney-General Olney had already "intruded" into California for the purpose of defending in the United States courts the power and rights of the Federal Government. Now the Attorney-General directed the United States Marshal to employ additional deputies in aid of the Federal power which was attacked within the State of Illinois. He also employed special counsel to aid the United States District Attorney.

Mr. Cleveland has explained that his own and Mr. Olney's theory was that "under the Constitution and laws, these subjects [carrying the mails and interstate commerce] were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the exclusive care of the United States, and that for their protection the Federal courts were competent, under general principles of law, to intervene by injunction." The President had determined to enforce the "supreme law of the land" within the geographical boundaries of the State of Illinois against the protests of the Governor of the State. The situation becoming desperate, and it being apparent that the decrees of the courts could not be enforced by the civil power of the Marshal, it was determined to employ the military for the purpose of preventing further violation of the law of the United States. Troops were sent to Chicago.

President Cleveland issued a proclamation containing the following clause:

"Whereas, for the purpose of enforcing the faithful execution of the laws of the United States and protecting its property and removing obstructions to the United States mails in the State, the President has employed a part of the military forces of the United States."

Subsequently, in answer to a protest from Governor Altgeld, Mr. Cleveland said:

"Federal troops were sent to Chicago in strict accordance with the Constitution and the laws of the United States, upon the demand of the Post-office Department that obstructions of the mails should be removed, and upon the representation of the judicial officers of the United States that process of the Federal courts could not be executed through the ordinary means."

Debs and others were arrested by the Federal authorities and charged with contempt in refusing obedience to the writs of injunction issued by the United States court. Debs was convicted and was sentenced to prison. He applied for a writ of *habeas corpus*. The application was denied by the Supreme Court, Justice Brewer delivering an opinion which should be read by all who believe that the Government of the United States is so impotent that it cannot enforce its laws against the opposition of State and local authorities.

Is the United States Government dependent upon the States for the enforcement of its laws? Is it even dependent upon its own courts? Said Justice Brewer:

"There is no such impotency in the National Government. The entire strength of the nation may be used to enforce in any part of the land the full and free exercise of all national powers; and the security of all rights entrusted by the Constitution to its care. The strong arm

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the National Government may be put forth to brush away all obstructions to the freedom of interstate commerce, or the transportation of the mails. If the emergency arises, the army of the nation, and all its militia, are at the service of the nation to compel obedience to its laws."

And if, as the court argued, the Federal Government may thus employ its physical power, it may certainly seek its end, the enforcement of its laws, including its treaties, by application to its courts.

"The General Government," said the court in the case of Martin *vs.* Hunter's Lessee, "must cease to exist whenever it loses the power of protecting itself in the exercise of its constitutional powers."

There is no uncertain ring in the voice of the judges; but there has been great and significant timidity in the attitude of the politicians.

When, in 1891, Mr. James G. Blaine declared to the Italian Government that the United States Government could not punish the New Orleans murderers of Italian subjects, he was probably right.

This was not, however, because there was no power to do so in the Federal Government; it was because Congress had not enacted a law for the punishment of crimes against treaty rights. Some treaties, like some laws, do not operate of themselves for lack of a sanction. Under the decision of the United States Supreme Court, however, it is plain that Congress has the power to enact a law providing for the punishment of all who offend against the provisions of its treaties. In the present case, no legislation is needed for the pressing emergency. It is equally clear from the decisions already cited that the United States courts, on the application of Government, may enjoin the Board of Education of San Francisco from carrying out its order against the Japanese.

If the members of the Board of Education refuse to obey the injunction, they may be adjudged in contempt and may be imprisoned; if there should be forcible resistance to the United States authorities by the local mob or government, or by the State itself, the Federal Government may compel obedience to the orders and judgments of its courts by the employment of all of its physical power.

The law of the case is so clear that the conclusion cannot be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

escaped that the political authorities must be conscious of the rights and powers of the Federal Government.

Why do not the political powers do their duty, then?

Why does not Congress legislate?

Why does not the Executive act?

Why is there no appeal to the courts whose just and patriotic views have been so often declared?

Why does not the Federal Government, which seeks to usurp the power of the States over their own citizens, enforce its own laws, protect its own honor, and thus escape from the ridicule that has lately been poured out upon it? Is there such potent cause of national dishonor in the labor vote of the Pacific coast? Judging from Mr. Roosevelt's message he is inclined to think that there is not.

ANTI-FEDERALIST.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FICTION OF JOHN OLIVER HOBBES.

BY W. D. HOWELLS.

If you come late to the literature of a given author, and then like it very much, you are tempted to offer, as a sort of reparation for earlier misgiving or neglect, the tribute of overpraise. I do not mind warning the reader at the outset that this is somewhat my case with the books of the very clever woman who had the caprice of calling herself "John Oliver Hobbes," as if that could long deceive, but who was really Mrs. Pearl Richards Craigie. She called her books, with a like willingness to mystify, by such names as "The Vineyard," "The Flute of Pan," "The Gods, Some Mortals and Lord Wickenham," "Some Emotions and a Moral," "The Soul Hunters," "The Dream and the Business" and "A Serious Wooing." There are others, as, for instance, "The School for Saints," which I have not read and apparently cannot, even in my regret for having read so tardily those named, which I have named in the order of my reading rather than of their writing. The talent which we may have our reserves about calling distinguished, but which is certainly uncommon, has now won definite recognition through the change with which the judgments of the present end, and the judgments of the future begin. While "The Dream and the Business" was still running its course as a serial, the news came that the author had ceased to live. If she had lived she might have written much more, and done greater things, but the things that she did showed waxing not waning power to the sudden close, and criticism has the consolation of dealing with the proofs rather than the promises of her talent. It has also the advantage of dealing frankly with some personal aspects of her authorship, as it could not if she were yet living. If she were yet living, you might hesitate to recognize the quality of her Americanism, for she was always an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American in the disguise of an English spectator of life, as she was always a woman's soul in the disguise of a man's name.

In some such manner she was always a Protestant, though she had put on Roman Catholicism, not for art's sake, but for conscience' sake, and yet not more convincingly than she had assumed the other phases. From time to time she paid her duty to the faith which she held in sincerity, but the temperament of her fiction was Protestant, Puritan; and, whether she held her hand or not, she never imparted to her fiction that relish of Romanism which, rightly or wrongly, is distasteful to the Protestant palate. She did not preach the doctrine to which she adhered, unless perhaps in the novel I have not been able to read. She did not try, as so many literary converts do, to convert her readers, and she therefore continued to interest them, if she did not always edify them. She did not always try to convert even her characters; if they were Protestants they were suffered to remain Protestants in most cases, against the open preference of the characters who were Catholics.

Her nationality was as wisely held in check. This was, no doubt, easier because her nationality was native to her, not only because she was born here, but because she was of an American origin so intense that it could hardly have been bred out in several lives. Those who have read her father's extraordinary autobiographical notes of English facts will know how commercial, how business, how advertising, this Americanism was in her immediate ancestry, and may be the more surprised that nothing of it all shows in her books. With her Puritan instincts, she does not take any such homiletic or didactic attitude toward the often lurid London life with which she has to do, as George Eliot was apt to take toward the too well-born or the too good-looking, and she does not cloy the reader with titles as a middle-class spectator might have been expected to do. Her lords and ladies are often no worse than their social inferiors, and sometimes they are better, morally and spiritually. Nothing of our national advantage is taken of the English who people her scene; not a fellow countryman or fellow countrywoman is introduced for their disparagement and still less for their defeat.

In her disguise of a man's name, she is not betrayed by that learnedness in wickedness which women affect in their satires of the world. Satirist she certainly is; but it is with the modera-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion and mercy of a man, at least for the men. She does not "lash" this or that person of her dramas, or if she ever does it is some heroine or anti-heroine who ought to be "lashed." In a few cases she allows these unworthy ones to be comic, to be amusing in their badness, but not often, as if she knew how dangerous a wicked woman is when she is comic, when she is amusing. Now and then she permits herself to make such women ridiculous, to make them disgusting, as with Nannie Cloots in "The Dream and the Business," but that is another thing. Generally she holds her hand, and lets them contrive their own disgrace, contenting herself with putting them in such light as will show them for what they are.

On the other hand, her heroines, her good women, are no such artificial beings as a woman, not deceived as to the nature of men, might have been expected to make them. They are apt to have just that measure of fallibility which keeps virtue on terms with charm. None of them are quite captivating; the author is too honest for such inventions; if she is not very strenuous about their being lifelike, apparently she has known too much of women to paint them personally irresistible, any more than to portray them morally perfect. There is here and there a young girl, like the heroine in "The Vineyard," who is equal to her fate when it is hard, and worthy of it when it is kind; but she is so by no miracle of the author's; she simply obeys a principle of character, and seems to work herself out by inherent strength, unweakened by an environment which has not been ennobling. Upon the whole, she seems the best, as she seems the most natural, female figure which Mrs. Craigie has drawn. Others, which the author has apparently toiled over much more carefully, much more insistently, have failed of like convincingness. The Italian girl in "The Gods, Some Mortals and Lord Wickenham," fails, first and last, to convince; she is never for a moment so "good" as the "bad" wife of the man who loved her and ought to have married her. In "The Flute of Pan," the Continental princess who marries the English lord, though she is so conscientiously studied in her imperfection, is not so charmingly lifelike as her cousin who is suffered to be amusingly wicked. In "The Dream and the Business," none of the women has the grace of a nature clearly divined, and then left to itself, like that of the young girl in "The Vineyard."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If I do not call these people by their names, it must be the fault of a memory breaking down under the multitude of its fictitious acquaintance. It is not for the want of reality in the characters, which, however imperfectly realized in their motives and actions, still do not lack the final stamp of personality. They are not convertible; they are not the same people repeated under different names; they are quite distinguished from one another; but they take a certain unreality from their circumstance. You could not confidently say that the author was not at home in county society, or in court circles, or among Nonconformist or æsthetic people, or Bohemians pure and simple, or aristocrats, but she seems an outsider with them all. Dr. Firmalden, the austere dissenter in "The Dream and the Business," is very well guessed, like many other very different characters; but he does not belong to his time and place. Perhaps if I knew his place better, I should not say this; but after the devastating effects of agnosticism, he affects me as belated, as a survival of extinct species and conditions. His son, reverting from this world to that other world, scarcely persuades you more; but his daughter, loving into æstheticism, and marrying into fashion, is somehow more credible. Yet neither of these is improbable in their natures; the worst you can say is that they would not happen in just the way they do.

It is, in fact, a very curious world that the author opens to you, a world not quite unlike the world you know by experience or hearsay, and yet apparently so much of her own discovery as to be almost quite her own. The effect is traceable to causes which the reader may say I imagine, if he will, and yet which I shall not think imaginary. Mrs. Craigie began to write at the time when the dispute about realism and romanticism was at the height of its fury, especially among those who knew nothing about it, and who probably now know less, because of the explantations. The critics chose Baal or chose Jahveh, according to their hearts rather than their heads, and they thought that the authors over whom they disputed were choosing too. So they were choosing, but according to their natures, not according to their convictions; and often they were working out results mortifyingly foreign to their principles. Being of a very mixed nature, the very interesting, the very clever, woman whose work I am, I fear, rather vainly studying, attempted a blend of realism and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

romanticism which was at any rate very novel. The attempt may not have been voluntary, and yet we must call it an attempt, in default of a more accurate word. She loved the look of life so much that she wished her creatures to be lifelike; if they were to be bad or good, ugly or beautiful, ignoble or noble, she felt that they could not do better than be lifelike. At the same time, she was so much in love with literature that she could not abandon its traditions; no one can who makes it. So she put her lifelike people into environments familiar to her from her favorite reading, or from her guesses or knowledges of the world where their like had their being. Over the entrance to this world of theirs—which was never the world they had come out of—at the openings of the chapters, that is to say, she put inscriptions from other authors, the farther fetched and the less immediately relevant the more valued. Sometimes the inscriptions were in prose, sometimes in verse, sometimes in English, sometimes in French, sometimes but rareliest in Italian; never, I think, in German. So far she indulged her literary, her romantic, her poetic, nature; and it was all very innocent and a little pathetic, because it was so unaffectedly affected. Within these densely lettered portals, for hardly less than three or four rather long legends ever sufficed, the more or less lifelike people you met were apt to behave pretty probably. At any rate, they rarely ceased to be lifelike or to be interesting; sometimes they were really charming, short of being captivating. At the worst, they wrote one another longish letters in italics. Sometimes they talked in epigrams; when they did not, the author talked in epigrams; but less and less, so that in her last book hardly any one, not even the author, talks in epigrams.

I suspect it was the epigrams which largely made the books' way with the public they won. It was never the largest public, and never quite the best; but it was very constant and very enthusiastic. In proportion to its smallness it felt itself very select. It believed that it was learning, or rather recognizing the world in the books—a bad, brilliant, noble, beautiful, self-devoted and epigrammatic world. Shall I own that it was Mrs. Craigie's public, as I saw it or heard it, which kept me so long from Mrs. Craigie's books? When at last I made my way to the books, I liked them so much more than I could have hoped that I thought myself bound to warn the reader against my liking.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the first place they are rather brief, the stories, and are on the American plan, as that used to be, rather than the English plan. Largely we learned form, in the days when we wished to have form, from the French, who, since nobody invents anything, must have learned it from some other people. Mrs. Craigie's books are shapely, and this not because of a prevalence of plot, as that cheap thing is commonly understood, but because of its absence. You are interested in her people for what they are and not what they have done to them. What they are is, in the later books, expressed for them in their own words and actions, which follow from their strongly imagined characters or natures. These are not, as in her earlier stories, at once declared by the author, so that she is not bound, in a hard and fast allegiance, to her postulates, but come out in their reciprocal relations. Preferably they are the characters and natures of young people in love, sometimes with other people's wives or husbands, but oftenest with one another in their unwedded freedom. This is the more creditable to them because in that English world to which they are attributed, but which is probably not the only English world, to be in love with some one else's wife or husband is so much expected that nobody is surprised. However, whether the lovers are unmarried or married, there is a great deal said from their suggestion as well as for their instruction, about love. All the other passions, all the other interests, are subordinate to this passion, this interest. Possibly that is one of the things which give an effect of unreality to the circumstances of people who were themselves sufficiently real. The circumstances of real people, people of our personal acquaintance, are such as to include the care of property or the earning more or less genteelly, of a livelihood; they mostly all have some business or other, and are almost never preoccupied with the passion or interest of love. In proportion as the author is a great or a trained artist, their business is shown or intimated, and the relation of their love to the rest of their life is ascertained. With the growth of fiction, an enlargement of the heart has followed, so that in most novels the organ affected usurps apparently the whole physique; hands, feet, legs, arms, head, stomach even, are absorbed into it. Mrs. Craigie's uncommon praise is that, if she suffers her lovers a preoccupation with love, she suffers it far short of the worst excesses; and she compensates the reader with the society of specta-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tors who are almost always more like the witnesses of such affairs in the world where he lives. In "A Serious Wooing," for instance, there is a group of brothers, sisters, mothers, uncles and aunts about the heroine whose reality, or whose simple, undramatic depravity and selfishness are so nicely, so amusingly studied that the reader is almost consoled for the heroine's aberrations from the normal family egoism. She goes off from two successive husbands with a rich, brilliant, devoted "Socialist," and lives with him in a free union which is apparently without regrets or penalties of any kind, sharing his activity in the "movement" upon terms unknown to Socialism outside of novelists or the imagination of capitalists. He is, in fact, so very unlike the Socialists who vote for candidates and seek to legislate their reforms, after the manner of other political partisans, as to be at the iron bidding of a secret authority which sends him hither and thither upon errands violently disruptive of the status, quite as if he were a dynamite-bearing anarchist.

The author is not to be solely blamed for this crimson ideal of Socialism, which is much that of American statesmen, and it ought not to affect the reader's faith in the rest of her world. Few have taken the pains, or had the wish, to know what Socialists are really like, but almost every one has desired the acquaintance of lords and ladies, princes and princesses, and even exiled queens, and these Mrs. Craigie lets us meet, or at least look upon, in figures that do not overtax credulity. Her lords and ladies are divided and environed like the rest of the English aristocracy, and are not too bad, and especially not too good, for belief. Her royalties are of foreign extraction, and are presently living out of their principalities, which are to be found in that mystical region where Mr. Anthony Hope first divined them in our time. They had been discovered in oriental regions long before by Mademoiselle Scudéry, and the other writers of French heroical romances, but he found them somewhat nearer than that Persia of the mind, in the remoter parts of Germany, or say Transylvania; and it is to his map that Mrs. Craigie has gone for their dominions. This does not show want of invention in her, but only a willingness to profit by the modern conveniences of fiction. At heart, she was probably an impassioned romanticist, but writing in a day when every novelist of artistic sense was obliged to own some allegiance to reality, she tempered her nature to the limits of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

heroical novel in its least impossible form, and atoned for her transgressions by the fidelity to life which many of her minor studies show.

One and all her people belong to a sophisticated world, whether they are like or unlike, perhaps because she deals with a world to which she was not born, and could fix only in its most superficial aspects, which are always sophistications. But they are not tedious sophistications, and they are not improbable. Shocking or amusing, they seem extremely good guesses, and the worse the natures or characters are, the better the guesses. Of course the women are better guessed than the men, and such degenerates as that neurotic girl, the anti-heroine, in "The Vineyard," and that bad wife in "The Gods, Some Mortals and Lord Wickenham," are almost the author's highest achievements, perhaps because they are the most reimagined from facts. For once, it might have been well to realize such types unsparingly; at any rate she has so realized them.

In her joint qualities of original Presbyterian and final Catholic, the author has presented what seems the unpuritanized nature of the English world better than almost any one else. She has always lived in this world, but she had inherited the incapability of being of it which is the birthright of us disinherited children of it; and when she had once felt the fact that it has a social rather than a personal sense of right and wrong, she won another advantageous point of view by escaping to an authority under which the sense of right and wrong is religious and in the keeping of unquestionable agents. It was a very curious equipment for a novelist, and possibly in her inherited and acquired spiritual make-up the elements were fatal to the artistic balance which she obviously wants. One is almost persuaded at times that she could have been the great artist she was not, if she had not been hindered by causes which we must call conscientious. But her conscience was without puritanic provincialism; it was the Puritan conscience reconscienced at Rome. It did not oblige her to punish transgression; it did not always suffer her to do so; among problem-novelists (for in a sort she belonged to that class) she stands almost alone in letting the representation of the case suffice, and leaving the rest to the reader's experience. She is a moralist, but of the new kind, though she is no more unique in that kind than she is in her kind of novelist.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Certainly she is an uncommon kind of novelist, and among those who have preferred to interest by character rather than incident, she has a place quite definitely her own: a place in which she will hardly be molested. In England she had a more ample public than in America; possibly because the number of English people who have the taste for olives is larger than the number of American people who have it. They must have noticed something strange in the flavor of her mind, something exotic, something that if it was not French was certainly not English; and which they could not know, as we could, for American. Even of us, not many could know it; perhaps her history could alone make us sure of her quality. But she had elements of popularity which insured her prosperity, her high acceptance with the public that likes olives, and with the less limited public that likes to have it thought it likes them, though it really prefers baked beans, with fifty-seven different kinds of pickles, such as it gets in the fiction canned at the rate of thirty thousand a day. With this simple-hearted mass, as well as with her more sophisticated following, epigrams go a very long way, especially epigrams about love, and, as I have intimated, there is almost no end to the epigrams about love in Mrs. Craigie's stories, especially in the earlier and poorer ones.

What would have been the effect with her talent if she had been aware of addressing a more critical public on either shore of the sea, it would not be useful to ask now, as far as she is concerned. You may say that it would have made her more and more regardful of form, both in the whole and in parts; but as it is she is conspicuous for form in the Anglo-American mass of literary journeymen and journeywomen; here she shines an artist among artisans. But being born of and to her conditions, her instinct was first to interest; to give her readers "easy things to understand" in the guise of hard sayings; to pique, but not to pique too much, the unwholesomer curiosities; to lead the horny-footed plebeian generation over the purple paths of aristocratic closes; and to touch with pathos the merited or unmerited sufferings of well-born or high-placed people. I can think of none of her books in which the struggle of life has the great rôle, or in which persons who earn an honest or dishonest living are the protagonists. The situations are therefore the situations of genteel comedy or of refined melodrama, and the persons are artificial, though they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are none the less real for being artificial; every one knows plenty of real artificial people. One follows their fortunes eagerly; the author arranges for that; but what she does not arrange for is a throe of undying sympathy for the best or the worst of them, no matter what hurt happens to them.

This is easily perceptible in the last work of her talent, "The Dream and the Business," which has the material, and almost the moral, dimensions of a great novel. Its range of character is large, and the characters are all probably and distinctly imagined; yet they do not move the heart, though their experiences are appealing. It does not matter that the early conventions of the John Oliver Hobbes romance are kept amidst the new evidences of power, that there are the mottoes in prose and verse, and English and French, to the chapters, that there are long and short letters in italics, that there are discourses about love, and epigrams, though rather fewer epigrams, on many subjects. All that would not matter if the real people were in a real world, or were worthy of their joys and sorrows.

I could not say why they are not, for the author seems a person of the sincerest purpose in her work, and is as unaffected in her mind as in her style, which must have been very simple and clear not to have demanded immediate comment. Whatever her pose is, and no one who writes is without a pose, it is not addressed to the love of a difficult or bizarre literary manner. She means to take and keep your interest, no more by her fashion of presenting her people, than by the invention of startling intrigues. It is in a way most respectful and self-respectful work; if it appeals to our weaknesses they are our higher weaknesses, our refinement upon nature; and the author parts with nothing of her dignity in making the appeal. What is to be said frankly and fully concerning her performance, first and last, is that, though here and there it is like the performance of this or that other, it is on the whole one of the most original literary performances of our Anglo-American day. Whether it is on the major or minor scale is another thing; I am afraid it is on the minor scale. Mrs. Craigie had the strength to be herself, but she had not the fortune to fashion others in her likeness; and she founded no school, or even formed a small class.

This, indeed, is not against her. Some of the greatest, like Hawthorne, left no school; some of the less than greatest, like

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dickens, were reverberated from every side. That is a matter of imitableness, and not originative power. How long Mrs. Craigie will be remembered, now that we shall have no more new books to remind us of her, is dependent upon a definition of the term. She cannot be forgotten in any study of her time. Whether her shapely and clever and brilliant books will continue to be read, I should not venture to guess, even. Whose books will continue to be read?

W. D. Howells.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MEDICO-ECONOMIC ASPECT OF THE IMMIGRATION PROBLEM.

BY THOMAS DARLINGTON, M.D., PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF HEALTH OF NEW YORK CITY.

MUCH has been, and is being, written about the social, racial and economic aspect of the immigration question. The purely medical aspect has received a share of attention, but much more can be said from this point of view.

In all its aspects, the immigration question is one of the most serious problems confronting the people of the United States to-day. Its various phases are closely intermingled and correlated. The question of individual health is dependent upon racial characteristics, and, in a wider sense, the social and economic effects are dependent upon both. The character of our population has changed so rapidly that we are but just awakening to find a stupendous evil confronting us. We must at once face the situation, realize the serious nature of the disease that threatens our national life and boldly apply the knife. Active measures must be taken to save the country from this threatening peril.

A New York school-teacher recently tried to get from her class some intelligent answers to questions regarding important facts in United States history. Vainly she labored. At last, in a moment of inspiration and desperation, she asked, "Where is Ellis Island?" Instantly, every hand in the room went up, and the light of intelligence gleamed from every pair of eyes,—the answer was as one voice. In speaking afterwards of the incident, the teacher said in a spirit of mock gravity: "I am convinced that United States history will have to be revised. We have always looked with veneration upon Plymouth Rock; our future generations will know it only as a legend; their history begins with Ellis Island."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The early settlers of this country were not immigrants as we now apply the term. They were of hardy stock, full of determination, and, above all, they were home-seekers and home-makers. They became an integral part of their adopted land and were, in truth, nation-builders. The resources of the New World seemed unlimited, men were needed to develop them and an influx of settlers was encouraged. The vista of physical discomforts, hard labor and isolated lives attracted only the vigorous, alert and ambitious of the Old World, and held out no inducement to the weakling and degenerate.

Thus came into being this greatest of republics; and, with world-wide recognition of its prosperity and richness, we have been forced to recognize the change in the make-up of our population. The settler is no more. The immigrant is a reality. The alien no longer comes to our shores as an organizer and builder of the nation, but as an adventurer, eager to take advantage of a widely heralded national prosperity.

From the point of view of the cities the immigration question assumes its most serious aspect. As a result of their situation, the coast cities suffer the most. New York City may be taken as the most representative of its class. As a port of entry, it ranks first. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906, 1,101,401 aliens were landed in this country; of this number 880,543, or eighty per cent., entered through the port of New York.

When the alien reaches New York, he is sent from the steamship direct to Ellis Island, the immigration station of the port of New York. There he takes his place in a line of his fellow passengers, and these in single file pass along a narrow, fenced-in passageway. A surgeon inspects them to ascertain if they have any mental abnormality; a few feet beyond him a second surgeon inspects them for physical defects; and still a third examines their eyelids for evidence of trachoma. If a surgeon detects any abnormal condition, the immigrant is termed "off the line" and is sent to a special place for a more extended examination later. These suspected cases are rigidly examined, and, in each instance where any deviation from the normal is discovered, the surgeon makes out a certificate of disability covering the facts in the case. The danger lies in the procedure after this, for each case is entitled to a hearing before a special board of inquiry.

An alien suffering from any of the affections classed as manda-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tory reasons for exclusion is readily disposed of, and is not a menace to our national health—with one exception, which deserves special attention and which will be mentioned later. The real danger is from the alien of poor physique, but no definite disease. If a citizen appears and offers either a verbal or written guarantee that the alien in question will not become a public charge, the latter is almost invariably admitted. It is needless to say that this guarantee is, in many instances, worthless; and the alien, by virtue of physical disability, soon becomes an inmate of some hospital or is otherwise cared for at the public expense. That this evil is real, and not imaginary, is plainly shown by the fact that, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906, there were certified by the surgeons at Ellis Island 5,747 aliens having poor physique or some physical abnormality. Of this number 1,117 were deported. Minor physical defects are not included in the above numbers, for 26,424 such cases were certified in 1905, and these were not considered as of sufficient gravity to warrant exclusion.

The fact that aliens of poor physique are particularly suitable for deportation is well shown by the following extract from a circular letter of the Commissioner-General of Immigration, dated April 17th, 1905. It includes this official definition of "poor physique":

"A certificate of this nature implies that the alien concerned is afflicted with a body but illy adapted not only to the work necessary to earn his bread, but is also but poorly able to withstand the onset of disease. It means that he is undersized; poorly developed, with feeble heart action, arteries below the standard size; that he is physically degenerate, and, as such, not only unlikely to become a desirable citizen, but very likely to transmit his undesirable qualities to his offspring, should he, unfortunately for the country in which he is domiciled, have any.

"It is deemed proper to add that, of all causes for rejection, outside of those for dangerous contagious or loathsome disease, or for mental disease, that of 'poor physique' should receive the most weight; for, in admitting such aliens, not only do we increase the number of public charges by their inability to gain their bread through their physical inaptitude and their low resistance to disease, but we admit likewise progenitors to this country whose offspring will reproduce, often in an exaggerated degree, the physical degeneracy of their parents."

This is all only too true. We are adding this most undesirable class to our population, and the results are appallingly apparent.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The exception to the mandatory deportable cases mentioned above is that of alien wives of citizens of the United States. These women are admitted, no matter what their physical condition may be. Our natural humanitarian impulse may lead us to characterize this as perfectly proper and to regard any other course as little short of barbarous, yet it is a menace of vital importance.

Prescott Hall, in his able work on immigration, states pertinently that "recent discoveries in biology show that, in the long run, heredity is far more important than environment or education, for though the latter can develop it cannot create." The truth of this dictum cannot be gainsaid. The health of the adult alien not only is a factor of grave import as regards his immediate and personal relationship to the community in which he dwells, but it reacts with the most serious consequences upon the country at large. Not only are the illiterate, physically unfit immigrants, now coming to us in such vast hordes, a menace in themselves, but the greater evil lies in their offspring who, by inheritance and environment, perpetuate the poor physique and non-disease-resisting qualities of their progenitors.

Incidentally to the medical inspection of school-children in New York City, the pupils are now subjected to a complete and rigid physical examination. During the first three months of the present year, 23,733 children were examined and 17,362 were found to be suffering from some physical abnormality. Of this number of defectives 12,170, or 70.1 per cent., were of foreign birth. It is safe to assume that a large proportion of the remainder were of foreign parentage, for their names give satisfactory evidence of foreign extraction.

In 1905 the 88 children in one truant-school in Manhattan were examined. Of these, 77 were found to be physically defective, 74, or 96.1 per cent., of these latter being of foreign birth.

It is impossible to ascertain the exact number of foreign-born children in the public schools in New York; but, using the United States Census report of 1900 as a guide, it is probable that about 40 per cent. can be listed in that category. Disregarding the direct economic loss to the City involved in caring for these physically unfit children, the danger to the nation from the acquisition of such a type of weaklings stands out in bold proportions as a serious menace to the future well-being and vigor of our country. The Department of Health of New York City

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is making most strenuous efforts to correct this evil by endeavoring to place these children under proper medical care, but the incoming tide threatens to overwhelm us with the magnitude and ceaseless oncoming of its flood.

Tuberculosis, that persistent, devastating plague, against whose inroads millions of money are being spent and the keenest forces of the medical profession and laity are making almost herculean efforts, furnishes an illustration of one of the many phases of this question.

In itself, it is a disease not directly inherited; but inherited poor physique, physical non-resistance, and unhygienic surroundings furnish a trio of predominant factors that predispose to it, and therefore it may be used to prove this point.

In 1902, there were in New York City 18,509 deaths from all causes; 5,724, or 30 per cent., of these deaths were due to consumption. Taking the number of deaths from tuberculosis during 1902 among residents of New York City between the ages of fifteen and forty-four years, and classifying them according to maternal parentage, we have the following results:

Native-born population	2,167,122
Deaths during the year from tuberculosis, native maternal parentage	637
Foreign-born population	1,270,080
Deaths during the year from tuberculosis, foreign maternal parentage	5,087

Another instance may be quoted. An investigation of 500 consecutive deaths of infants from diarrhœal diseases, in New York City, showed that 125, or 25 per cent., were of native parentage, while 375, or 75 per cent., were of foreign parentage. And this condition exists, although the native population of New York City is 63.5 per cent. of the total.

In connection with this phase, let us face the fact that the native birth-rate is decreasing, while that of the foreign population is showing an active trend in the opposite direction. One fact alone from the Census Bulletin No. 22 shows this with remarkable vividness. It is stated that between 1890 and 1900 there was a decrease in children born of native mothers of 13 per 1,000, and an increase of 44 per 1,000 for foreign mothers. This, in itself, cannot be classed as alarming; but, considering the physical characteristics of our foreign-born parents, it sounds a note of warning which it would be foolish to disregard.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the United States the results of the addition to our population are shown by the following facts: There are in the charitable and penal institutions of the country, including those maintained for the detention and treatment of the insane, 349,885 inmates. Of these, 11 per cent. are aliens and 17 per cent. naturalized foreign born, making a total of 28 per cent., although the number of foreign-born persons in the United States is only 14 per cent. Practically 33 per cent. of the insane in the United States are of foreign birth. The New York State Lunacy Commission, in March, 1904, reported that 60 per cent. of the insane patients in New York City were foreign born.

Keeping in mind the figures given by the last United States Census for New York City, let us consider the situation from another point of view. From 1885 to 1894, the total admissions to the hospitals for adults of New York City were 282,928. Of these 63.7 per cent. were of foreign birth. During 1905 there were admitted to seven of the largest hospitals of the City, 26,839 patients, of whom 12,550, or 46.6 per cent., were native born, and 14,289, or 53.4 per cent., were foreign born. Of the native born many were undoubtedly of foreign parentage. These hospitals practically all show an annual deficit in their operating expenses. Owing to the different methods of bookkeeping used, it is impossible to tell how large this deficit is. These institutions are all semi-private, and depend for their support upon the donations and bequests of the charitably inclined. Statistics of five of the hospitals for 1905 show that, of the total number of patients, 73.5 per cent. were treated free. The City pays to each of these hospitals a sum of money annually, based upon the number of free patients treated. Thus the burden of caring for the foreign-born patients is borne not only by voluntary donations of personal wealth, but by enforced contributions by the taxpayers at large.

The hospitals wholly supported by the City present even a greater problem, for the money is contributed wholly from City funds. In 1905, Bellevue and its Allied Hospitals treated a total of 35,199 patients; of these, 19,146, or 54.4 per cent., were foreign born. The appropriation for these hospitals for the year amounted to $648,480.76, so that $352,773.54 of this sum was directly spent for the care of sick persons of foreign birth.

The City and Metropolitan Hospitals treated 17,461 patients, of whom 10,533 were foreign born, a proportion of 60.3 per cent.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The total appropriation for the Department of Public Charities, under whose supervision these hospitals are maintained, was, for the year, $2,027,490.16.

The maintenance of the cases of contagious diseases, transferred from Ellis Island direct to the Kingston Avenue Hospital of the Department of Health of New York City, cost the Government of the United States, during the year 1906 (up to December), $84,340. This amount was nearly one-third of the total required for the expenses of the hospital. The figures given above do not take into account the various clinics and dispensaries of the City. None of these is self-supporting. Treatment is given only to those who are unable to employ a private physician, and the preponderance of foreign-born applicants for treatment over the native-born is enormous.

The Department of Health, from the nature of its work, directs the greater part of its attention to the crowded or tenement districts of the City. These districts are almost entirely inhabited by the foreign-born population. Ignorance, illiteracy and unhygienic methods of living render the people of these sections among the most frequent and persistent violators of the sections of the Sanitary Code. Disease, in all of its manifestations, is rampant in these areas, and the non-resisting physique of the people, coupled with overcrowding and uncleanliness, fosters its spread.

The health of the City is in the care of, and is safeguarded by, the Department of Health. The cost to the City is large, and the greater proportion of the expense is incurred by reason of the foreign element in our population. Contagious diseases flourish in these areas. Proper isolation and restrictive measures are difficult of enforcement when pitted against ignorance and lax compliance with sanitary regulations.

The wide prevalence of trachoma in our public schools is undoubtedly due to our foreign population. In 1902, vigorous meaurses to eliminate this disease were instituted by the Department of Health. Of the children in the schools, 10 per cent. were found to be affected, and these children were, almost without exception, of foreign birth or parentage. More stringent regulations in reference to the importation of persons afflicted with this disease, and more careful examination at ports of entry, are now keeping from us the worst cases of this class. But the Depart-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment of Health has been, and is, spending considerable sums of money to eradicate and control this strictly imported disease.

The greater part of the expense incurred by the Department of Health in examining school-children, and in caring for sick babies in the summer, is due to the large foreign element involved.

The Department of Health maintains a clinic for the treatment of communicable respiratory diseases. In 1904, out of 1,450 new cases of tuberculosis treated, 1,017, or 70.1 per cent., were of foreign birth. In 1905, 1,670 new cases were treated, including 1,064, or 63.7 per cent., of foreign birth. Of these latter, 65 gave a history of having had tuberculosis before coming to this country. The following table is of interest in this connection:

CASES TREATED IN TUBERCULOSIS CLINIC, JULY 1ST TO DECEMBER 31ST, 1905

Number cases pulmonary tuberculosis treated	767		
(*a*) Native-born	236	or	30.8%
(*b*) Foreign-born	531	or	69.2%
Foreign-born—(*a*) disease contracted before arrival in United States	27	or	5.1%
(*b*) Disease contracted within one year after arrival in United States	23	or	4.3%
Disease contracted from one to five years after arrival in United States	147	or	26.7%

What, then, is the remedy for this danger to our national body? Internal remedies are partially corrective, but not curative. Strive as we may, and with our best energies given to the task, we are failing to check its progress. Radical measures must be boldly applied, if we would perpetuate those virile and sturdy qualities which have placed us among the great nations of the earth.

From an economic point of view, the burden is fast becoming too heavy to be borne; from the standpoint of physical fitness, we are in danger of becoming a degenerate nation. It is too late to generalize; specific danger-signals are already before us. We must act. Decision is needed *now*. Let us briefly recapitulate the main points in our indictment and then plead our case and place it in the hands of the citizens of these United States as a jury to decide the result. The decision will be one of fundamental importance.

The indictment is that: 1. The present immigration law is inadequate to protect the country from the following classes of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

undesirable aliens: (*a*) the illiterate; (*b*) the alien of poor physique; (*c*) those suffering from minor physical defects. 2. The method of enforcing the law is faulty, because of (*a*) a hurried and therefore necessarily superficial method of physical examination at the port of entry, (*b*) easy methods of appeal in cases certified as physically deficient by the examining surgeons, (*c*) acceptance of inadequate surety, oral or written, that the physically defective will not become public charges. 3. The results of the present law and its manner of enforcement are that (*a*) the ratio of foreign-born to native inmates of asylums and charitable institutions is in great excess of the normal ratio of the same class of inhabitants; (*b*) there is a preponderance of foreign-born inmates of the hospitals; (*c*) New York City is saddled with an excessive cost of maintenance of foreign-born patients in the City hospitals; (*d*) children of foreign birth and parentage suffer from poor vitality as a result of hereditary influences, thus striking at the very heart of our national being; (*e*) the present class of immigrants are of poor stock and physically unfit. Our argument on these lines has already been presented. What, then, is the remedy?

This must come through a process of evolution, meeting the evils as they unfold themselves. The following suggestions are not new, but they are imperative. The law should be so amended that it will provide (*a*) an educational test, (*b*) the requirement that every immigrant should have at least $50, (*c*) inspection of all emigrants by American surgeons before embarkation, and perhaps some sort of certificate viséd, if possible, by the nearest American consul, (*d*) that a certificate of physical deficiency issued by an examining surgeon should be considered final reason for deportation, with no right of appeal except before a board of surgeons, and then only on the ground of an error in diagnosis. None of these suggestions is drastic except the last, yet that is the most important.

In conclusion, let us consider again the most important phase of this vital problem, as set forth in the annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1906, of the Hon. Robert Watchorn, Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York. In speaking of the citizens who give a guarantee that an alien certified for deportation will not become a charge on the public if allowed to land, he says:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The very best that can be expected of any guarantor of this class is that he will keep his word and see to it that the alien, whose deportation he prevented by his pledges and assurances, does in fact obtain his living otherwise than at public expense. But is that all that concerns the public? Is that all that appeals to an intelligent populace? Surely not! On the contrary, it is only the veneering, as it were, of the whole matter at stake. What guarantee, pledge or bond, no matter how valid, will avail a community in the event of the bonded alien, who is certified as of 'poor physique,' 'feeble-minded' or other designated forms of physical or mental degeneracy, becoming a progenitor, and leaving to it a legacy of American-born imbeciles as a reward for the consideration shown in not deporting him or her, as the case may be?"

THOMAS DARLINGTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE AUSTRALIAN WOMAN AND THE BALLOT.

BY ALICE HENRY.

WHILE suffragists and anti-suffragists are mostly compelled by the nature of the case to argue from either the logic or the sentiment of the position, and are continually driven to anticipate possible results, it may be of interest to the public in the United States to review the history of the movement in Australia, the country where the reform has been effected on by far the completest scale ever attempted or ever accomplished. A sketch of the Australian Constitution, an analysis of the causes that there led up to woman's enfranchisement, and an account of the methods successfully adopted there will show the points of resemblance and of difference between the movement in the United States and in Australia.

Up to the close of the nineteenth century, the seven colonies in the Australasian group were not only entirely independent of one another politically, but there was comparatively little co-operation between organized bodies and parties having similar aims in these different provinces. Even though railroad and steamship and telegraph were ever bringing the Colonies nearer together, distance, combined with the fact of distinct governments, seemed to make united action upon the part of any one set of people when scattered all over the continent at once difficult and futile. In common, therefore, with all other forms of political action, the propaganda for woman suffrage and the opposition thereto were carried on quite separately in the several colonies.

The experience of Victoria, however, as the colony in which the agitation was first started, may be taken as typical of what happened in all the others. The first legislative move was made in 1873, when the Hon. George Higinbotham, afterwards Chief

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Justice of the Colony, introduced as an amendment to an electoral bill a clause which, if passed, would have conferred the franchise upon women upon the same terms as those on which it was then held by men. The amendment was, of course, rejected, and subsequent attempts of the same nature met with no better success. It was not till 1884 that agitation outside of the legislature was seriously attempted. In that year, the redoubtable Mrs. Dugdale, backed by Mrs. Lowe—who in earlier days had done pioneering of a rougher sort, having been the first white woman to settle in the far west of Queensland,—Mr. Higinbotham himself and others formed the first Australian woman-suffrage society. Slowly, as it seemed to them, but very speedily indeed as it may appear in the retrospect, public opinion was being educated; and, by the early nineties, a number of circumstances combined to give the movement a forward impulse. The first of these was the return to Victoria of Miss Annette Bear (afterwards Mrs. Bear-Crawford), who, during many years spent in England, had been associated with such women as Mrs. Fawcett, Mrs. Percy Bunting, Mrs. Sheldon Amos and other veteran workers in the cause. She brought with her plans for combining the efforts of scattered societies into a United Council. About this time, also, the Labor Party came into existence and soon began to make itself felt in politics. Few of its leaders at first realized what a menace to themselves and their interests was the unrepresented woman in industry. With the closer organization of the Victorian Labor Party, that negative position was abandoned, the subject of woman suffrage was raised out of theoretical fogs and supported consistently by the Party. Repeatedly was a woman-suffrage bill passed by the Lower House, and as invariably was it rejected by the Upper House, a curious fossilized product, composed of landowners, nominally elected on a high property qualification, but as a matter of fact rarely elected at all, so seldom had its members to risk their seats by any process so disagreeable as an election.

Meanwhile, in the other Colonies, matters were not standing still. The New Zealand suffragists had gained their object in 1893. The 1st of January, 1895, saw the South-Australian women dowered with the vote. Western-Australian women followed suit in 1899, the change there being, for political reasons, supported by the Conservatives.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now entered a curiously complicating factor. On the first day of the new century, the five continental Colonies and Tasmania united into the Australian Commonwealth, New Zealand, on account largely of the fifteen hundred miles of rough sea which separated her from the others, standing apart. This meant a severing of all Australian legislation into two parts—national and state. National matters—including, for instance, tariffs, currency, mails, defence—were taken over by the newly constituted Federal Houses. State affairs were confined to such local interests as education, the care of children, crime, sanitation and agriculture. Under the new control, the women of South and Western Australia, because they had previously enjoyed the privilege of a state vote, automatically acquired the Federal vote. The women of the other Colonies (hereafter to be styled states), because they had had no voice in the management of state affairs, and for no other reason, were denied the privilege in relation to the larger national affairs. The Federal Parliament did not long leave matters in that unsatisfactory position. In its very first session, the Australian Parliament grafted on to the Act providing for its own future election a clause equalizing the political rights of men and women throughout the Commonwealth, giving to all adult women the right to vote for members of both Federal Houses. The ease with which this victory was won was due partly to the educative campaign that had for thirty years been carried on in all the states separately and in all the state houses from among the members of which the first Federal members were mostly drawn, and partly to the extremely broad and democratic basis of the Federal Constitution and the direct methods of election and representation prescribed. As it appears to me, the main point in which Australia differs politically from the United State lies here, in the more direct, and therefore more effective, mode of giving expression to the popular will.

This step on the part of the Federal Government facilitated the task of those who were struggling for state enfranchisement in New South Wales, Queensland and Tasmania. Even conscientious opponents recognized that to give to women a voice in national matters and to prevent them from sharing in the control of matters regarding which their knowledge was presumably both sounder and wider and their interest far more keen, would be a trifle inconsistent, not to say ludicrous. So, between 1902 and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1905, the state vote was conferred upon women in all these states. And now, alone among her sisters, it is the Victorian woman who, though she can express her views upon some obscure question of currency or patent rights, has no power to say whether or not Melbourne shall have a juvenile court.

In all probability, Australian women would not have had the ballot to-day if they had not concentrated all their forces upon the effort to secure it. It is sometimes difficult for a good woman to stop her ears when so many moral and industrial evils are crying for remedy, and to confine herself to urging so apparently remote and academic a remedy as the vote. But the argument there—and it has proved a sound one in this instance—was that the vote alone, when once secured, could bring about quickly, and with no waste of energy, reforms that otherwise must lag slow-footed behind legislation far less urgent and important. Consequently, because the women workers asked for this one thing and would be satisfied with nothing but this one thing, neither the energy of the women nor the interest of legislators and the public was dissipated and scattered.

Of all the plans tried in the campaign—petitioning, newspaper correspondence, public meetings and the persistent questioning in writing of candidates and legislators—the last seems to have been the only one that was worth the labor bestowed upon it. For years, every candidate for every office was questioned as to his views on this one subject. His answer, or the fact of his not answering, was filed; a careful record was kept of his subsequent speeches and votes, and he was called upon, politely but firmly, to explain any inconsistency between promise and performance.

If those Australian women who asked for the suffrage possessed one advantage over their American sisters in the comparative directness of electoral representation, they had another in the simplicity of the Constitution, both state and Federal. Even the Victorian women have had only two legislative bodies to convert, and no additional outside body of voters. No governor would veto a bill granting the franchise to women when passed by an absolute majority of both houses, nor has the Royal assent to a bill ever been denied under similar circumstances. Again, it told in their favor that the movement was never a fashionable one, the men and women who supported and labored for it having

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been, with few exceptions, of the working classes, so that the question was presented to the average working-class elector unhampered by any misleading or suspicion-breeding disguise.

The use of the future tense, so freely resorted to in discussions on woman and the use she will make of the ballot as a reason why she should or should not have it, is in practice discounted. "Hope thou not much, and fear not thou at all" is a sentiment that may well be impressed both upon those who expect impossibilities and upon those who dread imaginary evils. Ardent Radicals and cautious Conservatives among us have alike learned that results, either as seen in legislation or as traceable in changes in the mental outlook of women themselves, are wholesomely gradual. It is well that it should be so, that women should but slowly assume their full political responsibilities.

As regards educative effects, those have been most strikingly seen among conservative women. These have organized and taken part in movements for legislative reform, sometimes on party lines, more often on non-party lines, to an extent unknown before. There are also many proofs that there is a good deal of family discussion of public questions, of an unquestionably educative tendency, now that the women of the family are no longer ciphers, but openly acknowledged citizens. But, while the family which has added a new stock of subjects to the interest of breakfast-table conversation is so common as to attract no notice, the family disintegrated by political differences has not yet been unearthed, even by the most obstinate legislative councillor. I have been present at many political meetings, and at several elections in more than one state, and I have exercised my own vote. I have never, upon one single occasion, had reason to wish myself or other women away. The meetings have improved in tone and in earnestness; and women have, with Tennyson's ideal wife, gained in breadth of view. The polling-booths are as respectable as the vestibule of a railroad depot or a theatre, and the process of voting is as simple as that of buying a ticket. The ordinary housewife votes during the slack hours when she would be out marketing, very likely, anyway, the baby—who was to be, so we were told, so hopelessly neglected when his mother took to politics—often accompanying her in his go-cart.

The argument that women will not vote is completely disproved by Australian experience. They not only vote, but they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vote in continually increasing numbers as time goes on, and they become educated up to a sense of their political responsibilities and all that these imply. Not all the states discriminate in their returns between men and women voters, but those that do show something like the following: In South Australia, at the last general election, 59 per cent. of the men on the rolls voted, and 42 per cent. of the women; in Western Australia, 49 per cent. of the men and 47 per cent. of the women voted; at the last Federal election, 56 per cent. of the men voted, and 40 per cent. of the women. None of the Australian states has yet reached the extraordinary record of New Zealand, where, in 1902, nearly 75 per cent. of the women electors recorded their votes, as against 76 per cent. of their brothers.

It is unnecessary to add that the conservative woman votes. Her husband or father and their newspaper take good care that the duty of doing so is well impressed upon her, even though abstractly they may all three disapprove of woman in politics, and have striven to avert her appearing in that arena as long as they possibly could.

In the legislative world, the trend of the laws whose passage has been brought about, or hastened, by the direct political action of women is very clear. These constitute, largely, measures to remove disabilities from women and improve the condition of children, particularly homeless or neglected children. It is probably true that very few measures can be named which cannot sooner or later be obtained in other countries by the old, slow, indirect methods; but it is quite certain that there is no other country which can point to such a series of reforms brought about in such a short time, with so little friction and with such a minimum expenditure of energy—energy thus left free to take up newer problems and fresh educational work. Among the measures that can be traced to woman suffrage within the last ten years are prematernity acts, acts raising the age of consent, family maintenance acts, and many acts improving children's conditions by extending juvenile courts, limiting hours of work, providing better inspection, forbidding sale to children of drink, drugs and doubtful literature.

A word as to some of the above. While no English-speaking country goes to the French extreme of forbidding inquiry as to the paternity of an illegitimate child, most of them make the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

position as hard as possible for the mother by doing nothing for her in anticipation of the coming child's birth. A summons for maintenance of the child does not lie till after birth—that is, till after the time of worst trial, with its often awful collateral temptations to suicide and infanticide. Although, with a mockery of regard for the baby-life, the law indicts a girl-mother for concealment of birth, should she not make preparations for the expected event, it places in her hand no instrument through which she can obtain the means to so provide for the little one's coming. By these Australian acts, the father may be sued before the child is born, both for maintenance for the child and for the mother's expenses at the time. It is not that so many cases are brought forward, but the mere existence of a legal enactment makes it much easier for any friend of the girl's to obtain proper consideration for her from the man; and the influence of the law, too, is felt even more widely in its educative effect upon the sense of justice and the ethical standards of the community as a whole.

In Western Australia, again, where the women had pleaded for years for the raising of the age of consent, no improvement was possible till after the suffrage was granted to them, when the opinions of legislators on the subject of the protection of young girls underwent a remarkable and most sudden change.

In South Australia, where the women have been longest enfranchised, the care of neglected children is better understood, and the oversight of such children (under a state department) better controlled, than elsewhere. It was the first country in the world to have a legally constituted juvenile court. The New South Wales and Tasmania courts were among the first results of enfranchising women; while in Victoria (where alone the women do not possess the state franchise) a measure for establishing juvenile courts is still, after years of agitation, in the stage of a much-debated and very defective bill.

Any alteration in the relative industrial and economic status of men and women will be necessarily a slow process; but, in this connection, a noteworthy incident was the recent action of a Federal senator in introducing an amendment to the Public Service Act to equalize the rates of pay for men and women in the Federal Service. The significance of this fact is not that such a proposal was made, but that it emanated from such a quarter—not from an eager suffragist, but from an average politician, who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was thus giving the best possible proof that he was doing one of the things for which he had been sent into the House, attending to the interests of all his constituents, acknowledging in unconscious fashion that, as he in part owed his election to women, it was his duty to see that his electors were treated with even-handed justice. The principle has been already affirmed, and it only remains to be applied in practice.

That the welfare of the general community is subserved by the cooperation of women electors is seen by the adoption of some more general measures, such as laws dealing with the drink traffic, the gambling evil, and the sale of drugs (the importation of opium, for instance, except as specially prepared for medical purposes, being by Federal enactment entirely forbidden, throughout the Commonwealth). On all these points, the experience of Australia during the last ten years has been the same as that of New Zealand for thirteen years. The power of the best men in the community has been reinforced, and the hands of conscientious legislators strengthened by the addition of the woman's vote.

ALICE HENRY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WOULD ENGLAND SIDE WITH JAPAN AGAINST THE UNITED STATES?

BY MAYO W. HAZELTINE.

THE cordial tenor of the reference made to Japan by Mr. Roosevelt in his recent annual message has allayed the irritation caused at Tokio by the relegation of Japanese children in San Francisco to schools attended only by Orientals, and has for the present put an end to the apprehension that we might find ourselves drifting into war with a people whom we have helped to elevate to the front rank of civilized nations.

Unfortunately, whole peoples, like individuals, have their moments of folly or of madness, and such moments are peculiarly apt to occur in the hour of elation justified by triumph over a formidable antagonist. Those Americans whose memories stretch back to the years immediately following Lee's surrender at Appomattox will recall the truculent attitude assumed soon thereafter by our Government toward France and Great Britain, an attitude which resulted in the early withdrawal of the French troops from Mexico, and in the Treaty of Washington, by which Great Britain agreed to submit the "Alabama" claims to arbitration. It is not surprising that the Japanese should have evinced the same self-complacency and sensitive susceptibility to affront after their memorable victory over the colossal Russian Empire. We deem it, therefore, at least conceivable that the exasperation of his high-spirited subjects at the treatment of Japanese children in San Francisco might have compelled the Mikado to make a demand for reparation, to which we should have been unable to yield, and so we might have become involved in war without any deliberate intention of provoking hostilities on either side. Wars have often begun in that unpremeditated, accidental way, and so they will be begun hereafter, unless civilized nations shall agree

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that no resort to force shall take place until at least six months after an attempt has been made by The Hague tribunal to effect a reconciliation.

I. While, however, most of the questions relating to the outcome of a war between Japan and the United States have become academic, there are two which retain vitality, and are likely to be discussed until conclusive answers are elicited. Had the treatment of Japanese children by the San Francisco School Board led to hostilities between the Mikado's Empire and the United States, would the text of the Anglo-Japanese Treaty, concluded in 1905, have bound Great Britain to side with Japan against us? Secondly, admitting that the text of the treaty would have bound Great Britain to cooperation, would not the British people have compelled their Government to repudiate the compact?

As regards the former inquiry, there seems to be no doubt that it must be answered in the affirmative. It will be remembered that by the preceding treaty between Great Britain and Japan, the signatories agreed that each would assist the other should either be attacked by two or more great Powers. That treaty rendered impossible a repetition of the combination by which, in 1895, Russia, Germany and France compelled victorious Japan to restore to China the Liao-Tung peninsula and the strip of Manchurian seacoast connecting it with Corea. The present Anglo-Japanese Treaty, which was signed a little before the arrangement of the Peace of Portsmouth, but was not published until afterwards, went much further than its predecessor. It bound each of the signatories to aid the other, provided either should find itself engaged in war with even a single great Power.

This compact, of course, precluded any attempt of a reconstructed Russian navy to engage again in a contest with the Japanese fleet for ascendency in Far-Eastern waters. On the other hand, it assured Great Britain against a Russian invasion of British India, for that is an enterprise which no Russian commander would undertake if he knew that, before he could cross the Himalayas, the Anglo-Indian army would be strengthened with a hundred thousand Japanese auxiliaries. That is to say, the Japanese now are under a treaty obligation to play the same part in India which the Hessians played on the British side during our Revolutionary war. That his country might be able

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to rely on such assistance was, of course, the motive influencing Lord Lansdowne, then Minister for Foreign Affairs, to enter into a treaty, all the advantages of which would otherwise have accrued to Japan.

But, it may be asked, Was not the operation of the treaty limited to Central and Eastern Asia, or, in other words, to that part of the Asiatic Continent which lies east of the Persian Gulf and the Euphrates River? We answer, Yes. But, within the plain intent of the treaty, the Philippines are, geographically and strategically, as much a part of Eastern Asia as is the Japanese archipelago itself. Lord Lansdowne would not, of course, deny that he intended, by the Treaty of 1905, to bind his country to resist an invasion of the Japanese archipelago; how, then, can he escape the conclusion that he also bound England to cooperate in an invasion of the Philippines in the event of Japan's finding herself embroiled with the United States? The text of the treaty contains no clause excluding such a case from the purview of the compact, and Lord Lansdowne, as a far-sighted statesman, can hardly say that he took for granted that no such a case would occur.

As a matter of fact, if the conference at Portsmouth had not resulted in the conclusion of a peace, and if the Far-Eastern War had gone on for an indefinite period, until the Russians had tired out the Japanese, and compelled them to evacuate the Asiatic mainland, the latter, finding themselves confined thereafter to an empire exclusively insular, would have experienced an irresistible impulse to extend their dominion southward, and, as a preliminary step, would have felt themselves constrained to seize the Philippines. It is only because the outcome of the war with Russia has been to give Japan an unshakable foothold on the Asiatic mainland that her face is now turned definitely westward, and the Philippines have ceased to be for her an object of desire.

II. We deem it, then, indisputable that the Anglo-Japanese Treaty of 1905 would have required Great Britain to place her fleets and armies at the disposal of the Japanese, had the latter made war on the United States in consequence of the San Francisco incident. A treaty obligation, however, is one thing; a compliance with it another. We come, therefore, to the question whether the people of Great Britain, aroused to the grave re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sponsibilities imposed by the compact, would have permitted their Government to adhere to it. This second question we are inclined to answer in the negative. More than once in modern times has an English-speaking people forced its government to repudiate treaty obligations. In the reign of Charles II, that sovereign found himself for a time relieved by a French subsidy from the necessity of seeking supplies of money from Parliament. So exasperated, nevertheless, were the people of England at his agreement to join with Louis XIV in making war upon the Dutch, who, except the English, were the only maritime folk in Europe that then could claim to enjoy self-government, that he was ultimately forced to treat the compact as a dead letter. So, too, in the last decade of the eighteenth century, the members of the Federalist party, then preponderant in the United States, were so incensed at the French Republic, after the execution of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette, that they demanded a repudiation of the treaty obligations which we had contracted with France in 1778, and in such repudiation two Federalist Presidents practically concurred, although each recognized that, but for the assistance given us by France during our Revolutionary war, we could hardly have hoped to achieve independence of Great Britain.

Now, it is obvious that the British people to-day would have incomparably stronger reasons for refusing to make war on the United States, in pursuance of the alliance with Japan, than their forefathers had to denounce a treaty that bound them to make war upon Holland, or than the American Federalists had to treat as inoperative the French treaty during the closing years of the eighteenth century. It is true, doubtless, that the Japanese could render efficient service to the defenders of British India against a Russian invasion. Great Britain, however, would be exposed to an injury more vital than would be even the loss of her great Indian dependency, if, through facilitating a Japanese invasion of the Philippines, she were to provoke the United States to war. Undoubtedly, in such a contingency, we should make England pay the penalty for the damage suffered by us at the hands of Japan in the Pacific. We should invade Canada and cut off the grain-fields of British North America from communication with the Atlantic seaboard. With cruisers and with privateers we should do our best to prevent the grain-ships of Argen-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tina from reaching the British Isles. Above all, not an ounce of foodstuffs would be exported from the United States directly to Great Britain during the war, and effective measures would no doubt be taken to prevent such commodities from reaching the United Kingdom indirectly through neutrals.

Such a suspension of our export of food staples would, of course, prove a hardship to American producers, but it would mean starvation for the millions of toilers in British factories and mines. Even if we admit, what is sometimes disputed, that there exists at any given moment in the United Kingdom a stock of food sufficient to nourish the population for six weeks, it is patent that, soon after the expiration of that brief period, the bulk of the British people would be brought to their knees by famine. How long thereafter would the suffering millions permit the British Government to remain faithful to a treaty which imposed upon them such dreadful sacrifices? They would far rather let India go than purchase the retention of it at the cost of a war with the principal source of their food-supplies. The truth is that never again can England afford to face the consequences of a contest with the United States; and, if the present treaty with Japan binds the British Government to risk such an encounter, so much the worse for the treaty. All that we should ask of Great Britain would be that she should remain neutral in a conflict between Japan and the United States. We should not condescend to appeal for England's assistance, for we know that, with our immensely superior resources, we should go on fighting until we had brought the Mikado's Empire to a state of total exhaustion and paralysis.

It would have been better for all concerned if, while the present treaty between Great Britain and Japan was in course of negotiation, Lord Lansdowne had pointed out that, under no circumstances, would England consent to be drawn into a war with her chief food-purveyor, and that, consequently, the possible case of war between Japan and the United States must be expressly excluded from the operation of the treaty. At that time, the summer of 1905, the Tokio Government would have agreed to the insertion of such a clause, because it then was grateful for the tokens of sympathy received from the American people, and had no prevision of a quarrel with the United States.

MAYO W. HAZELTINE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE "COLOR LINE" IN THE ARMY.

BY CAPTAIN MATTHEW F. STEELE, U.S.A.

Is it not time to do away with the "color line" in the army of the United States? Sections 1,104 and 1,108 of the Revised Statutes require that "the enlisted men of two regiments of cavalry" and "two regiments of infantry shall be colored men." The Ninth and Tenth regiments of cavalry and the Twenty-fourth and Twenty-fifth of infantry are the four upon which the ban of color has been laid; by implication, colored men are, and always have been, excluded from the ranks of all the other regiments.

This law is to-day the only one upon the statute-books of the national Government which treats the negro citizens as a class apart—which sets up a "Jim Crow car" for them, as it were, and requires them to ride in it or in none. No more exclusive law can be found in the codes of Alabama or Mississippi. The law was passed in 1866, at a time when the negro and his welfare were occupying a large place in the thought of the nation's lawmakers. The country had just emerged from a terrible war of which the negro had been the main, if not the only real, cause. The purpose of the law, unquestionably, was to assure a civic right to the newly enfranchised citizen; its very enactment bespoke a fear in the minds of the lawmakers that the colored man, endowed by the Constitution with all the rights and privileges of the white man, would, nevertheless, be deprived of the privilege of entering the ranks of the regular army. The fear was a mere bogey then, and to-day it would be altogether forgotten but for this law which has kept it alive.

There are negro enlisted men in our navy, and also in the hospital corps, the commissary and the quartermaster's departments, and the ordnance corps of the army; but in the line of the army there are none save in the four regiments—two of infantry and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

two of cavalry—set apart for them. From the ranks of the artillery they are as firmly barred as from the railway coaches of the whites in our Southern States. This limitation, however, is true only of the enlisted men; the law does not prescribe that the commissioned officers of those four regiments shall be "colored men," and, therefore, does not by implication exclude colored men from the commissioned grades of other regiments and corps. There is, in fact, nothing in the law of the land to prevent a full-blooded Zulu from becoming the colonel of any one of our regiments, or the chief of any corps.

Of a truth, the law which places the mark of color on four of our regiments is out of date now, if it ever was timely. It is contrary to the spirit of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution, and to the good sense of the twentieth century. There is no good reason why blacks or whites should be excluded by the law of the land from any troop, battery or company in the service. Recruiting officers should enlist the best men to be had, without distinction of color, and each man should be assigned to a regiment according to his choice and the best interests of the military service.

The law fixing the taint of color upon four regiments does them an injustice and an injury, and in so much does the military service an injustice and an injury. It is to-day, forty years after, a recognition by act of Congress of the national prejudice against the negro. The *morale* of a regiment depends much upon its traditions and upon the esteem in which it is held by the people. The praises of a few persons, no matter how high their station, do not counterbalance the feeling within a regiment that it is looked down upon by the people. Within the army itself there is no prejudice against the colored regiments. The fine work they have done is known and appreciated there, without any claim, however, that they have done better work than the white regiments. The quality of a regiment's work depends mainly upon the quality of its officers, and no better officers are to be found in the service than those of the colored regiments. The soldiers of the regular army, white and black, have always given a good account of themselves in campaign and battle. In a fight, the color of a man's face cuts no figure, so long as it be not pale.

While there is no prejudice against the colored regiments within the army, it cannot be denied that nothing is rarer in our

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

service than an officer who prefers or seeks assignment to a colored regiment. Why? Because, when an officer goes back to his home, he wants to be able to speak with pride of his regiment to his people, and he wants to hear them speak of it with respect and esteem; he knows such will not be the case if his regiment is colored. The prejudice against the negro regiment is found without the army. It is not confined to any particular section of the country. It is no more of the South than of the North. There is to-day a larger proportion of officers in the colored regiments from the South than from any other equal section of the country. Shipp and Smith, who laid down their lives heroically leading their colored troopers at San Juan, were both Southerners; and there are scores of other Southerners in the colored regiments emulating the splendid soldierly example left behind by those two men as a precious tradition in their regiment.

The prejudice against the negro and the negro regiment is national; it is as wide as our territory. There is, for instance, a cavalry post in Vermont; but no colored troop has ever been, or is likely ever to be, stationed there. The people of Vermont do not want them. New-Englanders have always peculiarly loved the negro, but they do not love him in their midst; they prefer him away in Georgia or Louisiana, whither they can send him their sympathy by mail.

A few years ago, a fine troop of the Ninth Cavalry was stationed at Fort Myer, across the way from the National Capital, as a reward for specially good service in an Indian campaign. Never a word of complaint was made against the behavior of this troop; yet it is well known that never again will a colored troop be ordered to that post for station. The people of Washington do not want them. It is a notorious fact in the army that the political clique which holds the Yellowstone Park, the great national pleasure-ground, in the hollow of its fist will never allow colored troops to be stationed in the park. They are afraid that their patrons, the American travellers, will resent being held to the regulations of the park by negro troopers.

Since the disturbance at Brownsville, the broad State of Texas is, no doubt, closed forever against the negro regiments. When orders were issued a couple of years ago, sending a squadron of colored cavalry to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, letters of protest are reported to have been sent to the War Department by promi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nent persons of the adjacent town of Leavenworth. It has been proclaimed by the public press that negro troops must not be placed at the garrisons in the Southern States, and the Department has never yet ventured to station them in any of the Eastern or Middle-Western States.* The national prejudice has followed the flag across the Pacific Ocean. Five years ago, the colored regiments on duty in the Philippines were returned to the States at the demand of the Civil Governor of the Islands. No charge of misconduct was made against them; from a military point of view their service had been perfectly satisfactory.

Where, then, are the colored regiments going to serve hereafter? The ring of prejudice seems to be growing narrower all the while. Its geographical centre appears to be somewhere in the mountains of western Colorado at the present time; its circumference touches the Pacific shore in the west and reaches nearly to the Missouri River in the east. No protests have as yet been heard from Nevada or Idaho.

Truth to tell, our regiments should not be classified as white and colored. The legal stigma of color should be lifted from the four regiments upon which it rests; the legal restriction that compels the assignment of colored recruits to one of four regiments only should be removed. Sections 1,104 and 1,108 of the Revised Statutes ought to be repealed.

MATTHEW F. STEELE.

* A squadron of the Ninth Cavalry is at present stationed at Jefferson Barracks, Missouri, and another at Fort Sheridan, Illinois.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS REVIEWED.

BY H. CABOT LODGE, GENERAL O. O. HOWARD, U.S.A., CHRISTIAN BRINTON AND M. A. DE WOLFE HOWE.

"ORIGINAL NARRATIVES OF EARLY AMERICAN HISTORY."*

If the original narratives, the sources of history, are to be published for the benefit of the general reader, success in the undertaking is wholly dependent upon the manner in which the material is selected and edited. If the antiquarian theory that one fact is as valuable as another because they are both facts, be adopted, the results of the publication of original sources would be copious and would remain unread except by those who would read them in any event. If, again, to the antiquarian theory be added as an inflexible guide the doctrine of the scientific historian, illustrated by Professor Bury, that literature and history have no connection, a popular publication of original sources becomes at once a contradiction in terms and a sheer waste of good paper and ink.

Fortunately Mr. Jameson, the general editor of this excellent series, and his associates in the preparation of this first volume, evidently reject the view that all facts are equally valuable, and hold to the old-fashioned belief that there is a connection between literature and history. In practice, certainly, they demonstrate by this volume that they do not accept the theory of the equal values of facts or believe that literature has nothing to do with history, because they know that no one would read history destitute of literary quality except people who like to read catalogues, and unread history would be, to borrow the words of an American humorist, as "barren as an unkissed kiss."

* Original Narratives of Early American History. General editor, T. Franklin Jameson. "The Northmen, Columbus and Cabot," edited by Julius E. Olsen and Edward Gaylord Bourne. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1906.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In this volume on "The Northmen, Columbus and Cabot," and as the prospectus indicates, in its successors, the selection could not be improved. Judging from this volume alone, it may also be said that nothing could be better than the editing. We have the best texts accompanied by brief but clear introductions, and explained by notes which are sufficient to guide and instruct and not sufficient to puzzle and encumber. In each case a short list of authorities is given which will direct those who wish to pursue their inquiries upon any one of the three subjects, in the way in which they should go, to find all the sources and the last words of modern research and antiquarian learning. The selection and editing could not, in fact, have been better done for the purpose which the editors had in view.

That purpose, as I understand it, was to give in popular form to the general reader, not to the historian or historical student engaged in research, the principal contemporary narratives upon which early American history rests. It is a wise plan. There is no better way to learn history than to read it in the words of the men who made it, or who watched it in the making. The great mass of original sources are unmeaning and wearisome to the general reader, and only become possible to him when the real historian has winnowed and coordinated them and brought forth from the confusion the ordered narrative, interpreted, touched with imagination and graced by the quality of style which will give it savor and put it safely into the literature of the time or of the world. But among the welter of original sources, great and small, there are some narratives or documents with a literary charm of their own, and which also have the human feeling which alone makes history real to those who read. Of such narratives is this volume made up.

For the voyages of the Northmen we have so much of the Sagas of Eric the Red, and of the Flat Island book as tell of the expeditions to Vinland. In those Sagas is contained practically all the evidence that exists of the Norse voyages to North America, south of Greenland. The supposed monuments or relics which were once believed in have all withered in the light of investigation. The armor found in Connecticut, upon which Longfellow based his poem, and which unfortunately perished in a fire, was found to resemble so closely in workmanship and form the similar armor discovered at Palenque in Mexico, as to leave no doubt that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it belonged to the highly civilized Indians of the South. The inscription on the Dighton Rock, now unhappily perishing, is obviously Indian picture-writing, and the Stone Tower at Newport is an equally obvious mill-tower of a familiar English type. The mounds and hollows at Cambridge may be anything, but they prove nothing. The fantastic fabric of Norse settlements and Norse cities, reared by various writers from Gravier to Professor Horsford, rest on nothing but the imagination of the various authors. Indeed, Professor Olsen goes so far as apparently to give his authority to the proposition that Leif and his successors went no farther south than Nova Scotia. Yet the Sagas certainly seem to indicate, not only by the presence of the wild grapes, but by the description of the coast-line, that the Northmen came as far as Rhode Island, and Cape Kiarlanes agrees with Cape Cod, in their accounts, far more nearly than with any other portion of the coast. The great fact, however, is that in the year 1000 the Norsemen came to North America and followed the coast far to the south of Greenland. In the Sagas one finds the great and daring story told, a story delightful to read and ponder. The Sagas are traditional, oral in the beginning, but founded on a solid basis of fact with a surprising care and conformity of detail in many cases. But, above all, they are poetic in their essence, with the freshness and force of primitive folk-tales. They give us the first glimpse of America as it flashed for a brief moment upon the vision of Europe, but they give much more in their picture of that wild and daring race who, sword in hand, fought their way from the North Sea to Constantinople, and crossed and recrossed the wild waters of the North Atlantic in open boats which to-day would hardly be thought safe out of sight of land.

The Columbus story is a far greater one than that of the Norsemen, issuing out of the gray mists for one shining moment only to return again with the clash of steel and the roar of waves sounding ever about them. The story of Columbus is one of enormous achievement, so vast in its results that it cannot be measured even now. That his deeds wrought a political and economic revolution, even now still incomplete, is but part of his significance. He changed the current of the thoughts of men, something accomplished by only very few of the greatest of human minds. Of him it can be said, after his first voyage:

"And lo! Creation widened in man's view."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Here in this volume we have the journal of that first voyage, and there are few things that have been written about the adventures of men better worth reading. The earliest entries as he fared across the Atlantic are little more than the notes for a ship's log, and yet we can feel the excitement even now palpitating in each day's brief record. Every bird they saw, every bit of floating weed, every cloud shape in the heavens, was scanned, and in them all the Admiral thought he read the sign of land. Never had any man sailed for such a prize, and as we read we feel the strain in every word. It is of no great consequence whether Guanahani was Watling's Island or some other. It is the great fact that the new world was then and there discovered, which concerns us all. And this journal, simple, clear, full of faith and generous hope, brings home that fact in a way that no retelling of the marvellous tale could ever accomplish. It is all so human, so convincing, and, as we read the very words of the great Admiral, it all seems so near.

Then came the great tragedy,—one of the most terrible in history. The man who gave a new world, not only to Castile and Leon, but to mankind, and who changed the world's history, was sent back to Spain in irons, the victim of plots and intrigues. Here we have the famous letter to Doña Juana de Torres in which he cries out against his wrongs and demands justice. Thus it begins:

"Though my complaint of the world is new its habit of ill-using is very ancient."

It is a sad sentence, and yet the wit and the melancholy philosophy of it make one feel as if literary quality was of value not only in history, but even in original sources. The letter is a bitter cry which sounds now across the centuries, and here and in the last journal of the fourth voyage, which follows, we get a vivid picture of the man. His profound faith, his trust in Heaven, his turning to the Bible for inspiration and finally his vision, the voice that spoke to him out of the darkness uplifting his spirit in the midst of his most dire misfortune, all is here set down. Nothing can make us understand the man like his own passionate words, and the man who discovered America is worth realization. If any one wishes to wrestle with the endless questions and controversies of the Columbian voyages, it is easy to plunge into the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

countless books upon the subject. Meantime the general reader, little concerned with dates and identification of places, but profoundly interested in the fact of America's discovery, can find in these letters and journals the man himself, and live over with him the triumph, one of the greatest ever won, and the tragedy, one of the most piteous ever endured.

There are no Sagas, no journals or letters comparable to those of Columbus, which tell the story of the discovery of the Cabots. So the editors have turned very wisely from Acts of Parliaments, dry reports and modern controversies, to the letters from certain Italians to their masters in Milan and Venice, showing how the discovery of a new continent struck its contemporaries. Thus we get again the feeling of the time. It is only a brief, quite loose account from hearsay, of what had been found, but it brings us near to the event and makes it real. It is really not very vital to know whether John Cabot made his landfall in Labrador, Newfoundland or Cape Breton, although we are indebted to the patient learning of the scholars who have discussed and settled the question for us. But to all men the fact that, sailing in the service of the English King, John Cabot found North America and thus giving the title to England made it an English-speaking country, is of the deepest interest.

Here we find the story as men told it to each other and wondered over it from day to day just as the fifteenth century was dying. It makes us realize the event which is, after all, the best reason for reading any history. We read in these letters of the great discoverer attired in silk with vast honor paid him, and "these English running after him like mad people." He stands out a gallant figure, this daring sailor and Venetian citizen, with the wild Norse blood of his seafaring Jersey ancestors coursing in his veins, as we catch here a glimpse of him in the streets of London. But that single glimpse, with his brave attire and the shouting crowd, brings the man near to us, and with the man a better understanding of the lasting work he wrought. After all there is nothing better than this that history can do for us, and very few histories can do it quite so well as an original narrative with all its errors and imperfections on its head, if we are only fortunate enough to possess one which has both literary quality and real human feeling.

H. CABOT LODGE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"LEW WALLACE: AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY."*

NOTHING I have read, except, perhaps, "Ben-Hur," has so filled my heart and mind and thrilled me as this autobiography of General Lew Wallace. He thus begins his last review: "Before distractions overtake me, I wish to say that I believe absolutely in the Christian conception of God. . . . The Jesus Christ in whom I believe was, in all stages of His life, a human being. His Divinity was the Spirit, and the Spirit was God." That was characteristic of the man in all relations of life.

Wallace was very young when his mother died, herself but twenty-seven. As he describes her, she had a large, loving Christian heart. She was greatly puzzled by the restless, wayward boy, and repressed his truancy by many rigorous expedients, such as tying him to a bedpost, dressing him in girl's clothing, and the like. His devotion to the ferryman, whose aid he became in crossing and recrossing the Wabash, at last began to relieve her intense anxiety about him. His strong, military father, a graduate of West Point, used the rod to obtain obedience; so did most of his teachers. After speaking most tenderly of his mother, respectfully of his father and doubtfully of his early teachers, Wallace writes with feeling:

"I simply plead for discrimination, for forbearance, for teaching, for sympathy. Whoso lays his hand heavily on a boy of spirit . . . is himself an offender in far greater degree than his victim. The schoolmaster who cannot discriminate between pupils lacks the first essential to perfection in an honorable calling."

Again and again his heart cried out, "Mother, mother!" as it did when "the alabaster tinge was on her face," and she never again could respond to his call. I cannot help feeling that, had she lived, the Christian fellowship which she so much enjoyed would have been his in his early days, with its gentle discipline and moulding power, and given him in his youth a happier life.

His reference to that strong and abiding love which knitted him and his life-companion together is wonderful. Who could express it like Lew Wallace?

"The promises were in her face when next I saw her in plain daylight; and after all the trials of years, come and gone—now—the same promises are as bank-notes redeemed, and there is no need of them more. . . .

* "Lew Wallace: An Autobiography." New York: Harper & Brothers.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

My temper has never been so hot she could not lay it. She has decided me in doubt, defended me against interruptions, saved me my time by the sacrifice of her own, cheered me when down at heart, lured me back to my tasks when the tempter would have whisked me away, held my hand in defeat and rejoiced with me in my triumphs. . . . Hers is a high nature, a composite of genius, common sense and all best womanly qualities."

Read the book to complete the story of a great earthly love which merges into the heavenly. The steady development of a great, manly, though wayward, soul needed just this sunshine of a true and steady, perennial loving-kindness.

Wallace never loses his sense of humor. It will crop out in his dealings with the most serious subjects and often in his official reports; for example, when drilling his regiment at Evansville: "The grumbling was loud, sometimes angry; *but it was met with a spell of stone-deafness.*"

The story of his career as a young lieutenant of nineteen years in the Mexican campaign of 1847 is a gem by itself. His conclusions regarding General Taylor differ from mine. I think he would have modified them had he seen more of the man, but perhaps not. From Wallace's standpoint, General Taylor was unnecessarily severe with the 1st Indiana, Wallace's regiment. Wallace thinks that the intelligent reader of history will wonder greatly at the injustice done to the 2nd Indiana,

"but at nothing so much as at the General commanding [General Zachary Taylor]. There may even come to him [the reader] a realization of the lamentable fact that a man may have been a successful General and popular President of the United States, yet lack the elements without which no man can be truly great—justice and truth."

Wallace calls me to account for not going, in my biography of Taylor, behind General Taylor's report of the battle of Buena Vista. And now after new evidence has come to me I am glad enough to modify my original statements. Surely the 2nd Indiana Regiment, though it broke to the rear, was not to be blamed for obeying the order of its Colonel (Bowles), so clearly and distinctly given, namely: "Cease firing and retreat." General Wallace's defence of the regiment is perfect. The regiment itself, by its losses and subsequent gallantry on the field of Buena Vista, deserves unqualified praise.

Having been a Democrat, "one of the straitest of the sect,"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his sudden and strong conviction of duty to the Old Flag after the firing upon it at Fort Sumter is characteristic of the manly man. He thought carefully and systematically; he kept analyzing like a clear-sighted judge; he reached definite conclusions and then put them into immediate action. It is delightful to follow him, first to the Adjutant-Generalship of Indiana, thence to a regiment; then comes a brigade under General Patterson on the border of Maryland and West Virginia. Here Wallace had the first meed of praise, a recognition which gave him the joy which he then coveted: "The Commanding General has the satisfaction to announce to the troops a second victory over the insurgents by a small party of Indiana volunteers under Colonel Wallace, the 20th inst. [June, 1861]." Not only Patterson but McClellan recognized him: "Dear General Wallace:—I congratulate you upon the gallant conduct of your regiment. Thank them (your men) and express to the [successful] party how highly I honor their heroic courage, etc." Schuyler Colfax added his mite: "The President [Lincoln] told me day before yesterday that Indiana had won nearly all the glory so far. . . . The President alluded especially to your splendid dash on Romney." But after our failure at Bull Run, the Indiana men, being on but three months' enlistment, returned home and were mustered out.

Wallace's favorite, the 11th Indiana, reenlisted and was taken by him, its Colonel, to St. Louis. Here he found General Frémont in command. At Frémont's headquarters he was received in such a humiliating style that he said to himself: "Well, Ben. McCulloch with his red men and white savages can't be coming here. This is a headquarters for politicians, not soldiers." So, using the telegraph, he sought and obtained an order to proceed to Paducah, Kentucky, and so he came under the immediate command of General Charles F. Smith. Wallace's sketch of Smith is fine:

> "Tall, erect, broad-shouldered, a symmetrical figure in a well-fitting uniform. He held his head high; long white mustaches trailed below his chin, shading his lower face; perfect health left its morning colors on his cheeks, and his blue eyes, bright with invitation, negatived the reputation he bore for sternness."

Albert Sidney Johnston was regarded as the ablest Confederate commander in the West; General Charles F. Smith, on the Union side at the time Wallace met him, was believed by the army to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be more than Albert Sidney's match. The lessons General Smith gave Colonel Wallace during his sojourn at Paducah he never forgot. His hearty conformity to them brought him promotion on September 3rd, 1861. It was there that General Wallace entertained General Grant and part of his staff. Grant then "had not even fought the battle of Belmont. . . . Grant drew his chair toward the grate and said, spreading his hands before the blaze and looking around: 'Well, this *is* cheerful!'" One of the many charges of too much hilarity grew out of Wallace's entertainment. Articles very dreadful against Grant and Smith were published broadcast. Wallace says:

"In self-defence I finally traced the offensive articles to a regimental chaplain, and induced him to resign. The General himself, I think, acquitted me of blame, but certain members of his staff were not so generous."

It is not very long now before we find Wallace in active work, first with a brigade cooperating with the "Belmont affair" successfully; then on and on up the Cumberland to Forts Heiman and Henry (February, 1862), in conjunction with the good Admiral Foote and his Naval Brigade. When Grant moves over to the Tennessee to attack Fort Donelson, Wallace, soon to command a division, is left behind at Fort Heiman; but sudden need brings him forward, and with a good division he does his best military work. His account of the part his brigade played in the last attack upon the Confederates under General Buckner is clear and graphic.

In the order of time, we come to the great battle of Pittsburg Landing. I will not even attempt to summarize General Wallace's completed story of the operations of Halleck, Grant and Buel at this engagement of two days, usually called the battle of Shiloh (April 6th and 7th, 1862). He is as careful and minute, often as dramatic, as Lord Roberts was in his description of the siege of Delhi. And, surely, it would be wrong to attach any blame to Wallace himself for not getting upon the bloody field the first day; it is pretty clear that he and his splendid division led in the hard-fought and successful struggle of the second day. Halleck's later course toward Wallace is like the persecution that General Stone received after Ball's Bluff. He relieved him from his division and constantly prevented him from getting a proper command; yet when a defender of the Ohio border was demanded

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Governor Morton used his services, with a single regiment or brigade. When Cincinnati was threatened by Kirby Smith (Heth's Corps) in 1863, Wallace was put in charge of the great city, and promptly organized an army of successful defence. When Confederate Morgan and his troops raided Indiana, Wallace backed up every Union detachment, and with Governor Morton's help saved Indianapolis and the Confederate prisoners of war from capture. At last Mr. Lincoln, against General Halleck's protest, gave General Wallace the Middle Department, with his headquarters at Baltimore.

If one wants to study the work of a man who was a diplomatist, a general of resources, and a statesman, let him read carefully General Wallace's sketch of the Maryland plan and the battle of the Monocacy. It was a side-thrust to prevent General Early, with substantially two Army Corps, from marching into Washington (July, 1864). With an incredibly small force he met Early, and fought him so hard as to delay him at least twenty-four hours. This enabled Grant to get the 6th and 19th corps within the defences of the Capital. Then, of course, Washington, with its inhabitants and archives, was safe. Wallace had the credit from the President and Generals for this prompt and effective work.

To follow his diplomacy, that helped so largely to unite us in friendship with the Republic of Mexico — requiring perilous journeys to Texas and along its borders; to go with him as Governor of New Mexico, which he lifted so largely into proper civilization; to step with him over to Turkey, and see how by his large-heartedness he obtained the best things for us from the Sultan; will enable us to comprehend only a modicum of the public service he rendered to his country, to whose interests he was ever most devoted and loyal.

But, after all has been said, does not his unusual and permanent fame rest upon his literary works? He was a good and successful lawyer, but he did the law work, he says, as a bread-earner. He was a good public speaker, presenting his thoughts with clearness and beauty—but his heart was in his books. "The Fair God" caused me to review with care Prescott's "Conquest of Mexico,." "The Prince of India" startled me as a work of the imagination; but "Ben-Hur" is paramount; it is poetry, history, drama and devotion. It adds so much freshness to all

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

things it touches that it makes them new. It not only realizes the divine offices of the prophet, priest and king, but it vivifies the story of the Christ as nothing else has done outside the simple annals of the Gospels.

He told me on the Bosphorus the story of how he came to undertake "Ben-Hur"; substantially the same account is in this "Autobiography." No library or home in our land or any other land can afford to be without this book of extraordinary human interest and remarkable achievement. OLIVER OTIS HOWARD.

LELAND: SCHOLAR AND MYSTIC.*

AMONG those American men of letters who, toward the middle of the last century, undertook the discovery of Europe, Charles Godfrey Leland occupies a unique position. By turns German Bursch and Romany Rye, social lion in London and friend of Florentine Witches, writer of comic verse for "*Die Fliegende Blätter*" and lecturer before the Royal Institute, it is doubtful whether any of his compatriots became more closely identified with foreign life or more familiar with foreign tongues. Perhaps because of the very diversity of his achievement, Leland is less known and less clearly understood than he should be, and hence the recently published "Life" possesses particular claim to consideration.

It must be conceded at the outset that these absorbing volumes do not offer a uniformly analytical or judicial estimate of the picturesque and magnetic "Hans Breitmann." Based upon his uncompleted "Memoirs" and supplemented by numerous letters, the work is in essence the warmly affectionate and endearing tribute of niece to uncle. It is not that Mrs. Pennell permits personal loyalty or family considerations unduly to color her judgment, it is merely that she has been unable to escape the inherent appeal of her subject. Perhaps, after all, sympathetic biography is equally as valuable as scientific; in any case, it affords infinitely better reading.

Born in the famous "Dolly Madison house" on Chestnut Street, below Third, in the quiescent town of the Quaker, Leland represents the active rather than the passive principle of Penn-

* "Charles Godfrey Leland. A Biography." 2 vols. By Elizabeth R. Pennell. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sylvania mysticism. Presumably endowed with the same spiritual heritage as those about him, he early became a restless, insatiate nomad, both actually and mentally. As a lad he was considered "peculiar," and small wonder, for by twelve he was learning French, Latin and Spanish, and at fifteen was translating Villon and rapidly mastering Provençal. At Princeton, his "*Mala Mater*," as he sadly called her, where "piety and mathematics" were rated higher than linguistic accomplishments, Leland naturally made an uneven though brilliant record. Throughout the entire course he read voraciously, not, he says, "for a purpose, but to gratify an intense passion." He delved deep into metaphysics and mediævalism as well as Voltaire, Tom Paine and other "exploded dangers." One week he was a Transcendentalist, the next a Puseyite, and always he was a curiously eager, inquisitive intellectual explorer. The very narrowness and rigidity of his surroundings seemed to act as an inspiration, a challenge.

The transition from Princeton to Heidelberg was precisely what the delicate, bookish youth needed. Knowing the language well enough on his arrival to be christened "Germanicus," he entered lustily into student life. In a memorable letter to William Tiffany, dated July 24th, 1846, he exclaims with gusto: "What times! What men! What tobacco! What beer! Here, in Heidelberg, I have seen divers duels—clash and smash! But, my dear man, you have no earthly conception *what* a people the Dutch are for *kneipen*. The way they do smoke and drink beer is atrocious!" And yet he was himself no mere onlooker, adding, not without a touch of pride: "In this matter I modestly hint that *I* am not *small*." Each letter during this period rings with joyous, wholesome reaction against the arid and constrained traditions of Philadelphia and Princeton. There were numerous excursions to near-by towns or dances at country fairs, where the "proud and vicious nobles" (the students) participated none too decorously in the pleasures of "the poor and happy" (the peasantry). At Heidelberg our somewhat full-blooded young mystic devoted himself, oddly, to chemistry, but later in Munich he took up the study of æsthetics, which subject he continued the succeeding year at the Sorbonne.

While Paris at first proved sharply to him how thoroughly Germanized he had become, it was not long before he was taking

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his "*petit verre* and *café*" and joining gayly in the usual student balls and fêtes. That "extraordinary talent for getting into adventures" of which he often speaks by no means deserted him in the French capital, for the revolution soon broke about him in picturesque fury, and the big, striking American student did not fail to play his part with real, though conscious, bravery. In his own words he thus describes a day's campaigning:

"I turned out in the *Grande Révolution*, armed like a smuggler with dirk and pistols, saw some fusillades, helped build some barricades,—was *capitaine* at one nice little one in our Quartier, and distributed percussion caps and consolation to the heroic *canaille*, not to mention being at the plunder of the Tuileries."

He was not, however, a serious patriot, and did not wait to see affairs right themselves. His three years being over, he crossed the Channel to London and later sailed from Portsmouth, reaching home in the autumn of 1848.

His devoted biographer characterizes the next few years of Leland's life as being his period of storm and stress, and such they unquestionably proved. In order to appease the proprieties, he consented to read law, though he never practised, the claims of literature being more numerous and insistent than those of his clients. For a time he was in New York assisting Griswold on the "Illustrated News," returning later to Philadelphia as editor of "Graham's Monthly." Although pay was slender and uncertain, he worked unremittingly, contributing articles on an incredible range of subjects to the pages of the "Knickerbocker," the "Continental" and other long-since defunct publications. Though "Meister Karl" achieved a certain success, it was not until "Hans Breitmann" flashed into being that Leland became famous. It is quite true, as Mrs. Pennell reluctantly infers, that the younger generation does not read the "Breitmann Ballads"; yet, even so, it is refreshing to realize how hugely our fathers relished that delectable "mixture of beer and pure reason."

The welcome accorded "Breitmann" and the removal of financial pressure consequent upon the death of his father induced Leland to relinquish the position he then held on "The Press," and henceforth, save for a brief sojourn in Philadelphia during the early eighties, he passed the remainder of his days in England and on the Continent. Just as he had known every one of consequence in the world of letters, music and art at home, so

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

abroad he enjoyed the friendship of an equally distinguished circle. Always independent and outspoken, he was not one to be awed by the fetish of an exalted reputation. For Lowell, Holmes, Whitman, George Boker and others he professed the highest regard, but did not hesitate to fall foul of Emerson in the following not over-fastidious phraseology:

"Emerson dabbled with mysticism and paddled in metempsychosis, and shirked pantheism, as did Carlyle, while using it as a garment, and made beautifully talkee-talkee with free thought, and posed as a liberal mind, and exalted Goethe; but would have died of blushes and sunk into his boots before Greek fleshliness."

While the conventionally celebrated, such as Browning, Tennyson, Bulwer, Besant and the like flit through the latter portions of the book, Leland's lot was never wholly cast with them. What he loved most were the diverting by-paths of the mind; he much preferred the open road to a polished doorstep. Professor Palmer, the Orientalist, Francis Hindes Groome, the foremost Gypsy scholar of his day, and Borrow, then a grumpy reminiscence living respectably in Brompton Square, were the men he cared most about. There seemed always to have lurked in the heart of "the Rye," as Mrs. Pennell often calls him, a longing for Gypsyland, and it was old Matty Cooper, chief of the Romanies, who first opened wide to him the gates of this alluring realm. Within a remarkably short time he mastered the language better than Borrow had ever done; and some time later had the distinction of discovering Shelta, the tinker's dialect, hitherto unknown to scholars. His interest never flagged; wherever he happened to be, he would seek out his dark-eyed friends and chat familiarly with them, singing their songs and telling them stories in their own strange tongue. An unquenchable thirst for the occult and the untrodden led him still further afield. He unveiled the secrets of Voodooism and Witchcraft, collected all manner of legends and folk-tales, and as a result left behind him some of the most curious and enchanting books in the language. Despite his undoubted erudition and phenomenal powers of assimilation, it cannot be claimed that Leland possessed an exact or scholarly mind. Physically imposing and pictorial, he was temperamentally a romanticist. Enthusiasm for the subject in hand often led him to commit grave errors. In his list of Shelta terms were several Gaelic words, and his Algonkin legends were not all simon-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pure Algonkin nor even simon-pure Indian. Though younger and better-equipped men rapidly took his place in the field of linguistics and mythology, he will, however, always rank as a stimulating precursor; an inspiring, even commanding figure. While this "Life" of Mrs. Pennell's gives him the proper setting and shows him in exact relation to his surroundings, it is to be regretted that he left no record of that quaint, sedate, social atmosphere of which he was really a product and to which he often referred with such charm and penetration. That he might have pictured Philadelphia with incomparable sympathy is amply proved by a letter written from the Bagni di Lucca in 1893, in which he says:

"I wish I had thought of it—I would have made more of old Philadelphia. Should I ever return there, I will put *all my heart* into a book on the subject and write it all in flowers, perfumes—reeds in the rivers — quaint old golden-brown evenings — the scent of buckwheatcakes baking in the early morning—magnolia fragrance mingled with roasting coffee—ghosts of bygone Cadwaladers and Whartons and memories of pretty Quaker girls in the sunset light on Arch Street."

He goes on to say that "there are not many living *now* who can do it," and he was right. Yet the home call was never quite strong enough. He died abroad still a seeker, and a wanderer, fascinated to the very last by the mysterious and the remote.

CHRISTIAN BRINTON.

"LINCOLN THE LAWYER."*

THE man who writes about Lincoln has the happy privilege of placing a bright spot on every page, if he will, by quoting a few of Lincoln's written or spoken words. It may well be one of the effects of this cause that American editors—to the envy of their English brothers—hold the theme of Lincoln as an ever-ready refuge in time of trouble. They have learned by repeated experience that there is no name in American history with which they can conjure so successfully. Year by year, even as the actual workings of Lincoln's mind and heart become more familiar, he takes more surely the place of a great mythic figure, typifying something characteristically American, embodying the work of destiny or Providence in supplying our ship of state with

* "Lincoln the Lawyer." By Frederick Trevor Hill. New York: The Century Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the one helmsman who could have carried it safely through the worst storm it has had to weather. Has it not been much easier for him to take this place just because so many of his wisest words lent themselves extraordinarily to remembrance and quotation?

> "Still with parable and with myth
> Seasoning truth, like Them of old."

But the anecdotes were by no means all. Through his more serious utterances there often shone a sympathy and sagacity which seem destined to insure them a long future. The man you keep on quoting has a firm grip on immortality.

Look, for a specific instance, at the good fortune of him who would write of Lincoln as a lawyer. Here are Lincoln's own words of advice to lawyers:

> "Discourage litigation. Persuade your neighbors to compromise whenever you can. Point out to them how the nominal winner is often the real loser—in fees, expenses and waste of time. As a peacemaker the lawyer has a superior opportunity of becoming a good man. There will always be enough business. Never stir up litigation. A worse man can scarcely be found than one who does this. Who can be more nearly a fiend than he who habitually overhauls the register of deeds in search of defects in titles, whereon to stir up strife and put money in his pocket? A moral tone ought to be infused into the profession which should drive such men out of it."

The accepted ethics of the profession doubtless called for such a rebuke more generally fifty years ago than they do to-day. Yet the words are such, in spirit and substance, that Mr. Hill could hardly have gone wrong if he had taken them as a sort of text for his book, instead of giving them merely a casual place in his narrative. There was, however, no need of a definite text, which —at least in homiletics—often has its greatest use in keeping the preacher, when it succeeds, to a single line of thought. The consistency of Lincoln's legal career does this without calling for any special effort on the part of the biographer.

The study of Lincoln's life, from whatever angle it is viewed, derives its chief value from the light it throws upon his last four years. But for those years Lincoln, though still a notable figure, a characteristic product of American frontier conditions, would have been no more a national figure than many men who, frequently with less reason, have made prodigious names for themselves in their own regions. Just because he was called from the valleys and plains of our national life to its highest mountain-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

top, everything in his earlier years becomes immensely significant. When Mr. Alonzo Rothschild wrote his "Lincoln, Master of Men," he took pains to show in his opening chapters how Lincoln's quality of mastery displayed itself in the backwoods, in love, law and local politics, in the Douglas debates. All this was the indispensable premise to his conclusions of mastery in the dealings with his cabinet and generals. What Mr. Rothschild did so well on a larger scale, Mr. Hill, pursuing a more strictly "popular" method, and specializing in Lincoln's professional career, has performed successfully within narrower limits.

With such a story as Mr. Hill has had to tell, his book might be defined as a lawyer's brief for a lawyer and the legal profession. The bit of advice to lawyers, already quoted, illuminates Lincoln's whole conception of the lawyer's function. He saw it as it was—or might be in its essence. Most of the teaching which experience gave him was of the fundamental sort. Contrast it with the training of the modern city lawyer. There was no course at a law school, no beginning at the foot of the ladder in a highly organized office, no gradual emerging into independence and authority. Instead, at the beginning, there were the haphazard studies, the informal proceedings of rural courts, the invaluable nearness to unsophisticated human nature. Even as the junior member of one firm and the senior member of another, Lincoln is seen taking his forward strides with an informality unimaginable in these more ordered days. What stands out from it all is a twofold wonder—that from such inchoate conditions an important lawyer was developed, and that our own more formal influences can produce anything of the sort.

What is more important than all the outward circumstances touching the Lawyer Lincoln is that inmost personal thing which made him Lincoln at all. In the study of his legal career, one expects to find him dealing with his work, his clients, the juries and the courts, in a perfectly direct human way. This expectation is fulfilled. If he had cared more for red tape, he would have chosen some other method of delivering mail outside the New Salem post-office, when he was in charge of it, than tucking letters in his hat, and handing them out as he happened to meet the persons for whom they were meant. Later in life he would have devised a better plan for codifying the mass of papers on his desk than that of writing on one package of them, "When you

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can't find It anywhere else, look in this." The correspondence schools will not advise beginners in law or business to model themselves on Lincoln in every detail of office conduct. They will do well, however, if they can make their pupils realize, as Lincoln realized, the weightiest matters of the law. It is much to be able to write of a lawyer, or any one else, "that he never consented to do anything in a representative capacity which he would not countenance in himself as an individual." To match the spiritual directness from which such refusals sprang, there was an intellectual directness well illustrated in a passage quoted by Mr. Hill—a passage which throws a light of its own upon the merely educational value of mathematics:

"'In the course of my reading,' he told a friend years afterwards, 'I constantly came across the word "demonstrate." I thought at first that I understood its meaning, but soon became satisfied that I did not. I consulted Webster's Dictionary. That told me of *certain proof beyond the probability of doubt*, but I could form no idea of what sort of proof that was. I consulted all the books of reference I could find, but with no better results. You might as well have defined blue to a blind man. At last I said to myself, "Lincoln, you can never make a lawyer if you do not know what 'demonstrate' means," and so I worked until I could give any proposition of the six books of Euclid at sight. I then found out what "demonstrate" meant.'"

Both seeing and feeling as straight as Lincoln did, it was like him to define wealth as "simply a superfluity of things we don't need"; to abandon a guilty client; to advise lawyers against provoking litigation. This was not the way to immediate increase of legal practice; yet, besides being "good business" in the long run, it undoubtedly contributed much towards making him precisely what he became.

The final chapters of Mr. Hill's book show Lincoln in these last years applying to the great problems he had to solve the methods, mental and spiritual, of the wise and skilful lawyer. No one familiar with the qualities which the legal profession demands and generates in its best representatives needs to be told how much of Lincoln's strength in the Presidency resulted from that daily exercise which the practice of law had provided. It is the special virtue of Mr. Hill's book that it will bring home to many readers this important fact, and will help them to realize what a great man and a great profession may owe to each other.

M. A. DeWolfe Howe.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD-POLITICS.

ST. PETERSBURG: WASHINGTON.

ST. PETERSBURG, *November, 1906.*

IMPERIAL Russia has entered upon the "slack-water" period of its existence, the interval between the high tide of its fortunes and the ebb. For the Tsardom in the sense of an absolute monarchy has ceased to exist, whereas practical constitutionalism has not yet taken its place, may not indeed take its place for years to come. On the one hand, the Emperor's power is limited, strictly if not narrowly; and, on the other hand, control by the nation has not yet taken parliamentary shape; therefore, as the domestic affairs of Russia can no longer be administered without the combination of those two factors, the subjects of Nicholas II are being governed under difficulties. Curious problems have arisen in consequence and are now exercising all the ingenuity of M. Stolypin's Cabinet, which may be figuratively said to be endeavoring to drive a troika through the barrier of an imperial ukase.

The deadlock was caused by a one-sided self-denying ordinance issued by the Tsar before the first Duma assembled. Desirous of convincing his subjects, once for all, that the promise of a change from absolutism to constitutionalism was no mere will-o'-the-wisp, as the oppositional parties maintained, but a genuine concession to be realized as soon as possible, the monarch solemnly declared that in future no permanent law should be enacted without the assent of the people's representatives assembled in the Duma. Badly worded, like many another generous undertaking given by Emperors and Kings, this assurance was open to several interpretations, one of which was certainly calculated to defeat the object to attain which it was volunteered. Suppose, for instance, the second and the third Duma are composed of extreme

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parties, with whom the Tsar's ministers cannot work smoothly. What then? "Change the electoral law which results in the return of unpractical politicians," answer some people. But the feat is impossible. It should and would have been achieved last July, immediately after the dissolution of the first Duma, if the Government had felt itself authorized to meddle with the electoral law. But it did not. That law is one of the many matters which must remain as they are, unless the people's representatives after public discussion have consented to the proposed amendments. And that they will not do. Why should they destroy the ladder by which they rose and may again rise to power? Obviously, it is a "vicious circle": on the one hand, the Government may be unable to get together a legislative assembly willing to accept the present constitution and to work on the lines it traces; yet, on the other hand, it may not alter the electoral law in order to obtain a more businesslike legislature without the consent of the Deputies. And the Deputies will not agree to any proposal of the Cabinet. Clearly, that is a deadlock which could and should have been foreseen and prevented by those who formulated the Tsar's promise.

Again, Russian farmers are condemned by the operation of the same cause to suffer in patience the many hardships under which they have been fretting and chafing for generations. Now, for the second time in history, the Tsar's Government, awakened to a lively sense of its duty and its interest, is not merely willing but eager to make full amends for past neglect, and to pour the ichor of independence and enlightenment into the veins of the wasting peasantry; but its hands are tied, and tied by its own behest. Hence the world is treated to the unedifying spectacle of a Government and an Opposition, both professing the warmest interest in the material and moral well-being of the agricultural classes, yet each effectively hindering the other from redressing their grievances. What the "Cadets," or "Constitutional Democrats," virtually say is, that either they must be invested with power and allowed to legislate for the rural masses, or else there shall be no legislation for them at all. And as one of the remedies recommended by the Cadets is expropriation of the estates of the landed gentry, the Tsar, guided by his advisers, refused to put the power in their hands. In the last Duma, that party, without possessing a majority of Deputies, had the lead of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the house, being able at times to get together a plurality of votes; and it used this power to hinder all legislation in order to oblige the Tsar to alter the constitution, to consent to become a mere figurehead and to hand over the reins of government to its leaders. The experiment was a failure. But the Cadets have not modified their principles nor altered their tactics since then. On the contrary, they have, so to say, stiffened them very considerably by adopting in principle, at their recent conference at Helsingfors, passive resistance as one of their approved methods —that is to say, the refusal, by all their adherents in the nation, to pay taxes or supply military recruits. According to the laws of Russia, that refusal is tantamount to rebellion. Now, it is on the cards that these Cadets, who have already lost a large proportion of their supporters among the thinking and well-to-do people, may even with a much smaller minority than last time again get the control of the Duma. Ministers hope that this will not come to pass, but it is not by any means impossible. And, in this case, legislation would again be at a standstill and agricultural reforms must wait.

But the peasants will not wait. Once aroused from the torpor of ages, they cannot again be put to sleep. True, land is all they want for the moment—if possible, the free land promised by the Cadets, or, if that be a chimera, cheap land, and without delay. But, in order to still this land hunger which is driving many of them literally mad, they are ready to meddle in politics or to dabble in crime, to speak and vote with the republicans or to burn and kill with the anarchists. Moral laws would seem to have no restraining hold upon their will; indeed, unalloyed morality is perhaps wholly unknown to them. Such rudimentary grains of ethics as hitherto weighed with them were found combined with the ore either of religion or of politics, as part of their duty to God or their loyalty to the Tsar. Therefore, goaded by want and misery for which the present Government is responsible, and in sight of the promised land to which a Cadet Ministry undertakes to lead them, they would stick at nothing to reach the goal. This perhaps is the most serious danger with which the Russian Empire is menaced. Trade, industry, finances, the loyalty of the army and navy, the hegemony of the Russian over the Polish, Jewish, Lithuanian, Caucasian and other races, all depend upon the weal and good-will of the peasant. He is the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Atlas whose shoulders support the weight of the Tsardom; and, if he strikes work, all kinds of progress and development are arrested. The first institution to suffer would be the monarchy. Hence the zeal of the Tsar's Government to do tardy justice and hinder a catastrophe; hence, too, the desire of the extreme republican parties to checkmate the Government and to accelerate the catastrophe. The impossibility of making new laws without the Duma, or of convoking a reasonable Duma without new laws is consequently the barrier which the Monarchists have most redoubted.

But Stolypin bids fair to clear the obstacle. He is at this moment making a valiant attempt to drive his troika through the self-denying ordinance, without upsetting the three-in-hand or damaging the parchment barriers. The beginning has already been made, and by the time this article is in the hands of the readers of the REVIEW a series of remedial measures will have been promulgated by which the Premier hopes to score a victory and restore permanent peace to his country.

He will probably reap a large measure of success. But, whether a success or a failure, the scheme is highly ingenious. For, debarred in the absence of the Duma from making laws, he was driven to the interpretation of existing statutes and obliged to infuse all his reform schemes into these deductions. The Premier's ambitious plan, so far as one can discern it at this early stage, is to gain the allegiance of the peasants by giving them the ways and means of bettering indefinitely their material and moral condition; and, that done, to consolidate the power of the monarch and enable him to exercise to the fullest extent every right, every prerogative not expressly waived in the concessions accorded last October. The final upshot would be a strong constitutional monarchy, with the accent on the word "monarchy," but not parliamentary government.

Hitherto, serfdom in a modified form has continued to drag down the peasant class in Russia. The assertion may sound strange, but it is true. The husbandman and his heirs were bound to the soil by ties which the theory of the law allowed them to sever, but only under conditions that were always irksome and often practically impossible. The commune, or "Mir," which has aptly been described as "the crystallization of the powers of darkness," absorbed and wasted all that was best in the Russian

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peasant, except where a transforming religious spirit took hold of and regenerated him. If he possessed land, it was conjointly with the community, which could and often did redistribute the holdings. Therefore, he was unable to sell it, and he could not with profit put any money or labor into it except what was requisite for the coming harvest. His children, if he had many, were still worse off; because, if the holdings were insufficient, they were forced to stay on it. If they wanted to enter the state service, to become teachers, to learn a trade, the obstacles to be surmounted were formidable. In a word, hitherto the peasant was the slave of his community, which fettered him so long as he remained in its service, keeping him from accumulating wealth or obtaining culture, and tightened its iron grip upon him whenever he sought to escape and seek his fortune in other walks of life. The rustic parents who want to send their boy to a city school or train him to become a merchant, a clerk, a salesman, must first induce the Mir to approve the scheme. Very often the Mir refuses until its consent is bought, and so long as there is money to be had, so long may the blackmail be levied. Over and over again have budding talents, incipient success in life, family happiness been thus wrecked by an arbitrary order of the Mir dragging back the promising lad to the village of darkness and misery. It was always in the power of the Mir to put a sudden end to the young man's studies, to arrest his success in trade, to bar forever his progress in a craft. It exercised unchallenged sway over old men and young; it allowed or forbade any member to quit the community; it delivered passports or withheld them at its own will and on its own money terms. It was nearly omnipotent. And now it is being struck powerless.

This emancipation of 100,000,000 peasants from the most intolerable yoke, spiritual and material, that ever galled them, will be the welcome results of the first measure adopted by Stolypin. To crown the work, from January next, joint responsibility for taxes and other imposts will be done away with, so that, if a farmer pays his taxes he need not, as hitherto, tremble to think that a number of his neighbors may spend the proceeds of their harvest in drink, leaving him and his thrifty fellow members liable for their debts. He will be answerable only for his own obligations, and consequently stimulated to self-reliance, self-help, self-culture.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But, to the Russian *mujik*, reform without additional land is almost meaningless. His psychology is such that even a Messiah who should come to disenthral him could not gain a hearing, unless he reinforced his miracles by allotments of land. And, if Beelzebub were to offer larger holdings, his chances of gaining the peasants' support would be very considerable. For this reason, the Cadets made their bid of "cheap" supplementary holdings, which their stump orators and secret missionaries interpreted as "gratuitous" farms, and, as the Tsar's supporters could not cap this offer, they were left far behind. M. Stolypin, however, would not be beaten by this manœuvre. He caused the Peasants' Bank to buy a large number of estates from several landowners, who parted with their possessions for moderate prices. The Emperor, seconding his efforts, disposed of many millions of acres of the so-called "appanage lands" and also of Crown estates, and now the Government has it in its power partially to still the craving of the peasants' hearts. The money needed for this reform is seemingly dispensed with, for the farmer who wishes to buy the land now to be allotted may get the requisite sum from the Peasants' Bank in the form of a mortgage at a low rate of interest, and if the new holding be situated far from the old one he can quit the commune, sell the land which he hitherto possessed in undesirable partnership with others, and then migrate to his new home.

Now, this newly granted freedom is the result, not of a new law, but of a new interpretation of an old one. For this reason it is uncommonly interesting. Necessity is the mother of invention, and the juridical fiction invented was this: The Government jurisconsults hold that, when the serfs were emancipated by Alexander II in 1861, the Mir was a voluntary association. And this contention is tenable. In theory, at all events, no one was forced to continue to be a member of it against his will. Hence, a peasant who disliked agricultural pursuits on these lines could ask the community to give him a strip of arable soil for himself, which he might till or sell as he listed. What the community might say or do is another story. That was the state of things in 1861. Thirty-two years later, the departure of a peasant from the community was made much more difficult, indeed almost impossible, until the entire redemption tax on the land should be paid up. It is to this last clause that the Government has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tached all the weight of the new measure. At the end of this year, thanks to a ukase of the Tsar, the land-redemption tax will no longer be levied; and then the intention of the lawgivers of 1861, that the Mir be a purely voluntary association, will again be the principle of peasant legislation, and all other statutes involved must, therefore, be construed in the light of that. Such is the general formula; the applications of it are very ingenious. Buying and selling land will be simplified; title deeds will be accepted which heretofore would have been scoffed at, public notaries are authorized to cut short legal formalities and are obliged to cut down prices in proportion.

Peasant proprietorship in Russia will be the outcome of that new and clever interpretation of an old law, and may involve the gain to the ranks of the Government's supporters of, say, sixty million tillers of the soil, and the return to normal life under much more favorable auspices than heretofore of eighty or ninety millions. Further, it may strengthen the loyalty of the army and navy, conduce to the improvement of trade, industry, finances, and generally contribute to save the country from the ruin that threatened it a few months ago. But all these desirable contingencies can, of course, be realized only if a number of other conditions are also favorable, or, at any rate, are not actively hostile. One of the minor, yet very important, consequences of peasant ownership will be the possibility of improving the farm. Under the old "interpretation" of the law, a man who had a strip of marshy land as part of his holding could not drain it; another who needed some kind of artificial irrigation could not procure it; a third who required guano or a mowing-machine or some other means of heightening the fertility of his soil could not obtain them. For if he himself had the means he would not invest them, because at the next redistribution his improved holding might be assigned to one of his neighbors. And if he wanted to raise the money, people would refuse to lend it for the same reason. Under the new dispensation this difficulty will vanish. It will be the owner's interest to put his savings into his farm; and, if he have none, it will be to his advantage to borrow capital. And, from the outset, the Peasants' Bank will be empowered to make advances to farmers for the purpose of ameliorating their holdings.

Such, in broad outline, is what may be termed the final eman-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cipation of the Russian peasant. As yet, the Government's most important declarations on the subject have not been published; but before this letter is in print they will have been incorporated in the Statute Book. It would be difficult to overrate their significance. The reform seems calculated to better enormously both the land and the people, and to bring about a new condition of things in which a thriving democracy may live and work side by side with a constitutional monarchy. The idea of the present Government probably is that the monarchy should be constitutionally limited, but only as it was limited when the first Romanoff donned the Monomachus cap, that is, by the will of the whole Russian nation, while it would also be morally narrowed and restricted by the Tsar's consideration for the welfare of the nation. That, and not parliamentary government, is the régime which the October Manifesto substituted for the old bureaucratic autocracy, and the present Cabinet is resolved to continue as it has begun, to embody in political institutions all the liberties there bestowed upon the nation, and to do everything possible to get them assimilated. But nothing more is to be given in the way of a free grant. Further liberties must be the outcome of steady development, of fruitful labor, of political maturity. Such is the plan of M. Stolypin's Cabinet.

The worst enemies of that ingenious project are not the Cadets, whose influence is on the wane. Indeed, from the first the members of that political faction were principally their own enemies. The most formidable marplots at present are the Social Democrats and Social Revolutionists, but only in the missionary moods. When they have recourse to the bullet and the bomb and the torch, they may destroy but they cannot transform. Thus, the daring raid on the money-bags of the Treasury on October 27th was largely successful as a means of replenishing the nearly empty coffers of the organization, but it engendered a feeling of intense bitterness on the part of the lower orders of St. Petersburg, whose sympathies had theretofore gravitated towards the revolutionists. Normal people who retain the faculties of thinking and working are sick of bloodshed and violence, and a wave of conservatism, the crest of which appears to be reactionary, is now passing over Muscovy. It is only as silent, secret organizers that the revolutionists are dangerous. When they propagate their subversive doctrines among peasants, bluejackets, soldiers; when

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they write, print and disseminate leaflets, pamphlets, books; when they found sodalities, distribute money judiciously, thwart the efforts of the non-political elements of the population and, like Chinese torturers who hinder their prisoners from sleeping, keep the whole community in a state of continuous unrest and alarm, then indeed they are redoubtable.

In several parts of Russia the Social Democrats are exhorting the peasants not to heed the Vyborg Manifesto of the Duma, calling on them to refuse military recruits to the Tsar. "On the contrary," say the Socialists, "go with pleasure; don the soldier's uniform, and then get all your comrades to promise never to fire on the people, who are their brothers. That is your mission." They are flooding the Empire with tales, essays, proclamations, which are eagerly read by millions. It is hard to realize the vogue of this revolutionary literature and the guilelessness of the police and gendarmes who are deputed to stop it. Here in the capital, for instance, every house watchman, almost every policeman and soldier and servant, eagerly devour the badly printed booklets and pamphlets that are constantly passing from hand to hand.

Not only the army and the navy, but the University and grammar-school are now honeycombed with anarchism. It is often termed Socialism, but in last analysis it is Anarchism, pure and simple. And the new generation is saturated with it. This is probably the most alarming symptom of the national malady from which Russia is now suffering. For over two years the high schools, technical institutes, universities and colleges have been closed. The output of scholars, of graduates, of candidates for the learned professions has altogether ceased. The coming generation, in lieu of mental and moral training, is apprenticed to a guild which, in Russia at all events, repudiates culture and advocates violence. The consequences, when they manifest themselves, may be disastrous. Sooner or later the present generation of Russia must pass away and its place will be taken by the men who are now robbing, forging and bomb-throwing, instead of cultivating self-restraint and acquiring knowledge.

This year the conflict has again begun. It is but fair to say that the great majority of the students appear to be strongly in favor of attending lectures and leaving politics at the threshold of the University. They have said this in speeches and written it in letters to the newspapers. But the minority will not allow

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the lectures to take place without concessions, and these concessions involve the negation of all government and are incompatible with scientific work. Thus they claim the right to convoke meetings whenever they like, and the professors have complied with the demand on condition that the public from outside is not brought in. But this condition the students reject. Further, the professors ask that the meetings shall not be held during lecture hours; but the students convoke them just then, take possession of the most spacious lecture-rooms and will not be dislodged. Again, the professors ask that revolutionary politics be excludede from the topics discussed. The students, however, pay no heed to the request, invite outsiders, fulminate against the Tsar and his Government, and proclaim a strike of several days to honor the memory of bombists who have been hung.

A practical American would put a speedy end to this childish trifling. One way would be to abolish once for all the student class, and to allow citizens with certain intellectual qualifications to attend lectures at certain hours under determined conditions. They might come, sit, listen and take notes, after which they would quit the building as individual citizens, not as members of a corporation, still less as units of a state within the state.

Possibly, for these problems, as for the agricultural difficulty, M. Stolypin may find a speedy and satisfactory solution.

WASHINGTON, *December, 1906.*

THE principal topic of discussion in the Federal capital during the last ten days has been, of course, the Annual Message sent to Congress on December 4th, by President Roosevelt, and particularly the position taken by him in favor of centralization, a position which was emphasized by Secretary Root in a speech made by him in New York, at a dinner of the Pennsylvania Society, and which, we hear, is presently to be reaffirmed by Mr. Roosevelt himself in a Special Message. The Messages of the Presidents afford no precedent for such an outspoken advocacy by the National Executive of an extreme Federalistic, or Hamiltonian, interpretation of the Constitution. Some shrewd observers, indeed, see in this feature of the Message conclusive proof that Mr. Roosevelt has no intention of permitting himself to be forced into acceptance of a nomination for the Presidency in 1908. Had he contemplated such a thing as possible, they suggest, he would not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have gone out of his way to excite the jealousy and misgiving of champions of State rights, who may be expected to control many delegations to the next Republican National Convention. However that may be, it is certain that his views concerning the extent to which the Federal Government should absorb functions hitherto exercised by the constituent States is disclosed with perfect frankness. For example, when he asks for a Federal income tax he practically demands an amendment of the Constitution, seeing that the U. S. Supreme Court in Mr. Cleveland's second Administration declared a tax of that kind unconstitutional. He goes on to recommend another amendment of the Constitution, which shall provide for a national divorce act. Then, again, he asks Congress to enact legislation which will enable the Federal Government to enforce the rights of aliens under treaties, irrespectively of State authority. If such legislation had been placed long ago upon the statute book, the lynching of subjects of the King of Italy in Louisiana would have been punished, and the relegation of Japanese to a particular public school in San Francisco would have been enjoined by a Federal Court, in the event that such relegation should be adjudged a violation of the treaty between the United States and Japan. Another step towards centralization is Mr. Roosevelt's request that Congress should authorize the creation of a permanent Federal Board of Arbitration, the function of which should be to investigate disputes between employers and employees. He does not ask, as yet, that the decisions of such a board should be compulsory, as they are in New Zealand, because he believes that they would exercise a decisive moral influence on the community, by disclosing the merits of the controversy.

The President's championship of centralization is not limited to the proposals above named, far-reaching as these are. He declares elsewhere in his Message that it must not be supposed that, with the passage of the Railway-rate bill, the Pure-food bill and the Packing-house Inspection bill, it will be possible to stop progress along the line of increasing the power of the National Government over the use of capital in interstate commerce. There will ultimately be need, he says, of enlarging the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission in several directions, so as to give that board a larger and more efficient control over the railroads. He is convinced, he tells Congress, that the best

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

way to avert what he deems the very undesirable move (made by Mr. W. J. Bryan) for the governmental ownership of railways, is to assure to the Government, on behalf of the people as a whole, such adequate control and regulation of the great interstate common carriers as will do away with the evils which have given rise to the agitation against them. He holds, in a word, that the Federal Government should not conduct the business of the nation, but that it should exercise such supervision as will insure the conducting of business in the interest of the nation.

The President does not name Mr. Hearst in his Message, but evidently aims at him in a remarkable passage, wherein he denounces demagogues. Discussing the relations of capital and labor, he points out that there are agitators who seek to incite a violent class hatred against all men of wealth. Such men seek, he says, to turn wise and proper movements for the better control of corporations, and for doing away with the abuses connected with wealth, into a campaign of hysterical excitement and falsehood, in which the aim is to inflame to madness the brutal passions of mankind. Mr. Roosevelt declares that the sinister demagogues and foolish visionaries who are always eager to undertake a campaign of destruction are in reality the worst enemies of the cause they profess to advocate, just as the purveyors of sensational slander in newspapers or magazines are the worst enemies of all men who are engaged in an honest effort to better what is bad in our social and governmental conditions. In the President's judgment, to preach hatred of the rich man as such, to carry on a campaign of slander and invective against him, to seek to mislead and inflame to madness honest men whose lives are hard, and who have not the kind of mental training that will permit them to appreciate the danger in the doctrines preached—all this is to commit a crime against the body politic, and to be false to every worthy principle and tradition of American national life. Mr. Roosevelt is convinced that our country's only hope of welfare and progress lies in a resolute and fearless, but sane and cool-headed, advance along the path marked out in the first session of the Fifty-ninth Congress. There must be, he insists, a stern refusal to be misled into following either the base creature who appeals and panders to the lowest instincts and passions, in order to arouse one set of Americans against their fellows, or that other creature, equally base but no baser, who, in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a spirit of greed, or to accumulate or add to an already huge fortune, seeks to exploit his fellow Americans, with callous disregard of their physical and spiritual well-being. From the viewpoint of the President, the man who debauches others in order to obtain for himself a high office stands on an evil equality of corruption with the man who debauches others for financial profit. Nothing, again, could be plainer than the allusion to Hearstism in the averment that the plain people who think, the men to whom American traditions are dear, who love their country and try to act decently by their neighbors, owe it to themselves to remember that the most damaging blow which can be dealt to popular government is to elect an unworthy and sinister agitator on a platform of violence and debauchery.

The President's reference to Cuba in his Message has put an end to the impression which, for a time, seems to have been current in Havana, that the provisional Government established by us in that island might be maintained for an indefinite period. On the contrary, Mr. Roosevelt explicitly limits to "a few months" the term during which the provisional Government will administer Cuban affairs. That government will come to an end as soon as a new general election shall have been held, and a new native Administration shall have been inaugurated in peaceful and orderly fashion. At the same time, Mr. Roosevelt warns the Cubans that they must not expect a periodical interposition by the United States for the purpose of restoring order. He adjures them solemnly to weigh their responsibilities, and see to it that, when their new Government is started, it shall run smoothly, free from flagrant denial of right on the one hand, and from insurrectionary disturbances on the other. They may do well to heed his admonition, for he tells them frankly that, if their elections become a farce, and the insurrectionary habit becomes confirmed in their island, it is absolutely out of the question that Cuba should retain independence.

In proposing that the Federal Government shall levy a graduated inheritance tax, the President does not lay himself open to the charge, which he incurs when advocating a Federal income tax, of protesting against the limitations of the Constitution, for the constitutionality of a Federal inheritance tax has been declared by the U. S. Supreme Court. Mr. Roosevelt holds that an inheritance tax should be levied by the Federal Government,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

instead of by the States, because an attempt to impose such a tax in one particular State often results merely in driving the corporation or individual affected to some other State. There is, of course, nothing new about a Federal inheritance tax. Such an impost was first levied as long ago as 1797, when the framers of the Constitution were alive and conducting public affairs. That was a graduated tax, the rate being increased with the amount left to any individual. A similar tax was imposed in 1862, a minimum sum of one thousand dollars in personal property being exempted from taxation, while thereafter the tax became progressive, according to the remoteness of kin. Finally, during our war with Spain, the revenue act of June, 1898, provided for an inheritance tax on any sum exceeding the value of ten thousand dollars, the rate increasing in accordance with the amount left and with the legatee's remoteness of kin.

Conformably to the President's request, the treaty signed at Algeciras was ratified by the Senate in the week ending December 15th, but it was coupled with a resolution, which, in the minds of the other signatories, may cast considerable doubt on the completeness of the ratification. The treaty would not have been ratified without prolonged and strenuous resistance, had not the Senate previously adopted a resolution declaring that, in sanctioning the treaty, it had no purpose of departing from the traditional American foreign policy which forbids participation by the United States in the settlement of political questions entirely European in their scope. In other words, it is the commercial, and not the political, features of the treaty to which our Federal Senate makes the United States a party.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EDITOR'S DIARY.

THURSDAY, *December 13.* Autocracy or Democracy?

WEDNESDAY, December 12th, 1906, will be recorded in history as the day upon which the most audacious Federal Administration the country has yet known announced a deliberate purpose to effect a complete revolution in the form of our Government that has maintained since the thirteen original States embodied their compact in the Constitution of the Union. On the evening of that day, the Secretary of State, the Honorable Elihu Root, addressing the Pennsylvania Society of the City of New York, administered a stinging rebuke to such commonwealths as, in the judgment of the President and himself, had in their legislation disregarded the interests of the whole people, warned them of the danger to their separate authorities which they had thereby incurred, and served upon them formal notice of the intention of the Administration to obtain new constructions of the Constitution which would vitiate the reliance they have hitherto placed upon that instrument as a safeguard of the rights explicitly reserved in Article X of the ratified amendments. It was a memorable and amazing declaration and fraught with possible consequences so momentous and far-reaching that its full import has not yet reached the comprehension of the people.

The thesis of the Secretary of State comprised three separate *dicta* in logical sequence: (1) A marking of the tendency towards absorption of complete authority by a centralized government; (2) Frank admission of further encroachments upon local powers in contemplation by the Administration; and (3) A positive threat to obtain from the highest judicial tribunal, "sooner or later," constructions of the Constitution that will "vest the power where it will be exercised—in the national Government."

Since Alexander Hamilton failed in his final desperate endeavor to deprive the people of what was then considered to be their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inherent right of local self-government, no statesman has ventured hitherto to propose the establishment of concentrated control similar in every practical effect to that which the masses of Russia are at this very day struggling to lift from their stricken land. That there may be no misapprehension of the definite and resolute purpose of the Administration, we present herewith the exact words of the Secretary of State relating to the three broad propositions:

The tendency:—

"It is plainly to be seen that the people of the country are coming to the conclusion that in certain important respects the local laws of the separate States, which were adequate for the due and just regulation and control of the business which was transacted and the activity which began and ended within the limits of the several States, are inadequate for the due and just control of the business and activities which extend throughout all the States, and that power of regulation and control is gradually passing into the hands of the national Government.

"Sometimes by an assertion of the interstate commerce power, sometimes by an assertion of the taxing power, the national Government is taking up the performance of duties which under the changed conditions the separate States are no longer capable of adequately performing. The Federal anti-trust law, the anti-rebate law, the railroad-rate law, the meat-inspection law, the oleomargarine law, the pure-food law, are examples of the purpose of the people of the United States to do through the agency of the national Government the things which the separate State governments formerly did adequately, but no longer do adequately."

That the statutes specified have been enacted into law is undeniable. It is equally certain that those recently passed were driven through the legislative bodies under the whip and spur of the Federal Administration, which did not hesitate to exercise its full power of coercion and bribery through the distribution of patronage to enforce its will upon an obviously reluctant Congress. The disingenuous assertion that the enactment of such laws and the "gradual passing of control into the hands of the national Government" meet with the approval of the sober sense of the people is purely assumptive and finds no confirmation in the reduced Republican membership of the House of Representatives. It is, however, probably true that the fostering and encouragement to growth of a paternalistic spirit by an ebullient Administration have given rise to such a "tend-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tached all the weight of the new measure. At the end of this year, thanks to a ukase of the Tsar, the land-redemption tax will no longer be levied; and then the intention of the lawgivers of 1861, that the Mir be a purely voluntary association, will again be the principle of peasant legislation, and all other statutes involved must, therefore, be construed in the light of that. Such is the general formula; the applications of it are very ingenious. Buying and selling land will be simplified; title deeds will be accepted which heretofore would have been scoffed at, public notaries are authorized to cut short legal formalities and are obliged to cut down prices in proportion.

Peasant proprietorship in Russia will be the outcome of that new and clever interpretation of an old law, and may involve the gain to the ranks of the Government's supporters of, say, sixty million tillers of the soil, and the return to normal life under much more favorable auspices than heretofore of eighty or ninety millions. Further, it may strengthen the loyalty of the army and navy, conduce to the improvement of trade, industry, finances, and generally contribute to save the country from the ruin that threatened it a few months ago. But all these desirable contingencies can, of course, be realized only if a number of other conditions are also favorable, or, at any rate, are not actively hostile. One of the minor, yet very important, consequences of peasant ownership will be the possibility of improving the farm. Under the old "interpretation" of the law, a man who had a strip of marshy land as part of his holding could not drain it; another who needed some kind of artificial irrigation could not procure it; a third who required guano or a mowing-machine or some other means of heightening the fertility of his soil could not obtain them. For if he himself had the means he would not invest them, because at the next redistribution his improved holding might be assigned to one of his neighbors. And if he wanted to raise the money, people would refuse to lend it for the same reason. Under the new dispensation this difficulty will vanish. It will be the owner's interest to put his savings into his farm; and, if he have none, it will be to his advantage to borrow capital. And, from the outset, the Peasants' Bank will be empowered to make advances to farmers for the purpose of ameliorating their holdings.

Such, in broad outline, is what may be termed the final eman-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cipation of the Russian peasant. As yet, the Government's most important declarations on the subject have not been published; but before this letter is in print they will have been incorporated in the Statute Book. It would be difficult to overrate their significance. The reform seems calculated to better enormously both the land and the people, and to bring about a new condition of things in which a thriving democracy may live and work side by side with a constitutional monarchy. The idea of the present Government probably is that the monarchy should be constitutionally limited, but only as it was limited when the first Romanoff donned the Monomachus cap, that is, by the will of the whole Russian nation, while it would also be morally narrowed and restricted by the Tsar's consideration for the welfare of the nation. That, and not parliamentary government, is the régime which the October Manifesto substituted for the old bureaucratic autocracy, and the present Cabinet is resolved to continue as it has begun, to embody in political institutions all the liberties there bestowed upon the nation, and to do everything possible to get them assimilated. But nothing more is to be given in the way of a free grant. Further liberties must be the outcome of steady development, of fruitful labor, of political maturity. Such is the plan of M. Stolypin's Cabinet.

The worst enemies of that ingenious project are not the Cadets, whose influence is on the wane. Indeed, from the first the members of that political faction were principally their own enemies. The most formidable marplots at present are the Social Democrats and Social Revolutionists, but only in the missionary moods. When they have recourse to the bullet and the bomb and the torch, they may destroy but they cannot transform. Thus, the daring raid on the money-bags of the Treasury on October 27th was largely successful as a means of replenishing the nearly empty coffers of the organization, but it engendered a feeling of intense bitterness on the part of the lower orders of St. Petersburg, whose sympathies had theretofore gravitated towards the revolutionists. Normal people who retain the faculties of thinking and working are sick of bloodshed and violence, and a wave of conservatism, the crest of which appears to be reactionary, is now passing over Muscovy. It is only as silent, secret organizers that the revolutionists are dangerous. When they propagate their subversive doctrines among peasants, bluejackets, soldiers; when

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they write, print and disseminate leaflets, pamphlets, books; when they found sodalities, distribute money judiciously, thwart the efforts of the non-political elements of the population and, like Chinese torturers who hinder their prisoners from sleeping, keep the whole community in a state of continuous unrest and alarm, then indeed they are redoubtable.

In several parts of Russia the Social Democrats are exhorting the peasants not to heed the Vyborg Manifesto of the Duma, calling on them to refuse military recruits to the Tsar. "On the contrary," say the Socialists, "go with pleasure; don the soldier's uniform, and then get all your comrades to promise never to fire on the people, who are their brothers. That is your mission." They are flooding the Empire with tales, essays, proclamations, which are eagerly read by millions. It is hard to realize the vogue of this revolutionary literature and the guilelessness of the police and gendarmes who are deputed to stop it. Here in the capital, for instance, every house watchman, almost every policeman and soldier and servant, eagerly devour the badly printed booklets and pamphlets that are constantly passing from hand to hand.

Not only the army and the navy, but the University and grammar-school are now honeycombed with anarchism. It is often termed Socialism, but in last analysis it is Anarchism, pure and simple. And the new generation is saturated with it. This is probably the most alarming symptom of the national malady from which Russia is now suffering. For over two years the high schools, technical institutes, universities and colleges have been closed. The output of scholars, of graduates, of candidates for the learned professions has altogether ceased. The coming generation, in lieu of mental and moral training, is apprenticed to a guild which, in Russia at all events, repudiates culture and advocates violence. The consequences, when they manifest themselves, may be disastrous. Sooner or later the present generation of Russia must pass away and its place will be taken by the men who are now robbing, forging and bomb-throwing, instead of cultivating self-restraint and acquiring knowledge.

This year the conflict has again begun. It is but fair to say that the great majority of the students appear to be strongly in favor of attending lectures and leaving politics at the threshold of the University. They have said this in speeches and written it in letters to the newspapers. But the minority will not allow

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the lectures to take place without concessions, and these concessions involve the negation of all government and are incompatible with scientific work. Thus they claim the right to convoke meetings whenever they like, and the professors have complied with the demand on condition that the public from outside is not brought in. But this condition the students reject. Further, the professors ask that the meetings shall not be held during lecture hours; but the students convoke them just then, take possession of the most spacious lecture-rooms and will not be dislodged. Again, the professors ask that revolutionary politics be excludede from the topics discussed. The students, however, pay no heed to the request, invite outsiders, fulminate against the Tsar and his Government, and proclaim a strike of several days to honor the memory of bombists who have been hung.

A practical American would put a speedy end to this childish trifling. One way would be to abolish once for all the student class, and to allow citizens with certain intellectual qualifications to attend lectures at certain hours under determined conditions. They might come, sit, listen and take notes, after which they would quit the building as individual citizens, not as members of a corporation, still less as units of a state within the state.

Possibly, for these problems, as for the agricultural difficulty, M. Stolypin may find a speedy and satisfactory solution.

WASHINGTON, *December, 1906.*

THE principal topic of discussion in the Federal capital during the last ten days has been, of course, the Annual Message sent to Congress on December 4th, by President Roosevelt, and particularly the position taken by him in favor of centralization, a position which was emphasized by Secretary Root in a speech made by him in New York, at a dinner of the Pennsylvania Society, and which, we hear, is presently to be reaffirmed by Mr. Roosevelt himself in a Special Message. The Messages of the Presidents afford no precedent for such an outspoken advocacy by the National Executive of an extreme Federalistic, or Hamiltonian, interpretation of the Constitution. Some shrewd observers, indeed, see in this feature of the Message conclusive proof that Mr. Roosevelt has no intention of permitting himself to be forced into acceptance of a nomination for the Presidency in 1908. Had he contemplated such a thing as possible, they suggest, he would not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have gone out of his way to excite the jealousy and misgiving of champions of State rights, who may be expected to control many delegations to the next Republican National Convention. However that may be, it is certain that his views concerning the extent to which the Federal Government should absorb functions hitherto exercised by the constituent States is disclosed with perfect frankness. For example, when he asks for a Federal income tax he practically demands an amendment of the Constitution, seeing that the U. S. Supreme Court in Mr. Cleveland's second Administration declared a tax of that kind unconstitutional. He goes on to recommend another amendment of the Constitution, which shall provide for a national divorce act. Then, again, he asks Congress to enact legislation which will enable the Federal Government to enforce the rights of aliens under treaties, irrespectively of State authority. If such legislation had been placed long ago upon the statute book, the lynching of subjects of the King of Italy in Louisiana would have been punished, and the relegation of Japanese to a particular public school in San Francisco would have been enjoined by a Federal Court, in the event that such relegation should be adjudged a violation of the treaty between the United States and Japan. Another step towards centralization is Mr. Roosevelt's request that Congress should authorize the creation of a permanent Federal Board of Arbitration, the function of which should be to investigate disputes between employers and employees. He does not ask, as yet, that the decisions of such a board should be compulsory, as they are in New Zealand, because he believes that they would exercise a decisive moral influence on the community, by disclosing the merits of the controversy.

The President's championship of centralization is not limited to the proposals above named, far-reaching as these are. He declares elsewhere in his Message that it must not be supposed that, with the passage of the Railway-rate bill, the Pure-food bill and the Packing-house Inspection bill, it will be possible to stop progress along the line of increasing the power of the National Government over the use of capital in interstate commerce. There will ultimately be need, he says, of enlarging the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission in several directions, so as to give that board a larger and more efficient control over the railroads. He is convinced, he tells Congress, that the best

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

way to avert what he deems the very undesirable move (made by Mr. W. J. Bryan) for the governmental ownership of railways, is to assure to the Government, on behalf of the people as a whole, such adequate control and regulation of the great interstate common carriers as will do away with the evils which have given rise to the agitation against them. He holds, in a word, that the Federal Government should not conduct the business of the nation, but that it should exercise such supervision as will insure the conducting of business in the interest of the nation.

The President does not name Mr. Hearst in his Message, but evidently aims at him in a remarkable passage, wherein he denounces demagogues. Discussing the relations of capital and labor, he points out that there are agitators who seek to incite a violent class hatred against all men of wealth. Such men seek, he says, to turn wise and proper movements for the better control of corporations, and for doing away with the abuses connected with wealth, into a campaign of hysterical excitement and falsehood, in which the aim is to inflame to madness the brutal passions of mankind. Mr. Roosevelt declares that the sinister demagogues and foolish visionaries who are always eager to undertake a campaign of destruction are in reality the worst enemies of the cause they profess to advocate, just as the purveyors of sensational slander in newspapers or magazines are the worst enemies of all men who are engaged in an honest effort to better what is bad in our social and governmental conditions. In the President's judgment, to preach hatred of the rich man as such, to carry on a campaign of slander and invective against him, to seek to mislead and inflame to madness honest men whose lives are hard, and who have not the kind of mental training that will permit them to appreciate the danger in the doctrines preached—all this is to commit a crime against the body politic, and to be false to every worthy principle and tradition of American national life. Mr. Roosevelt is convinced that our country's only hope of welfare and progress lies in a resolute and fearless, but sane and cool-headed, advance along the path marked out in the first session of the Fifty-ninth Congress. There must be, he insists, a stern refusal to be misled into following either the base creature who appeals and panders to the lowest instincts and passions, in order to arouse one set of Americans against their fellows, or that other creature, equally base but no baser, who, in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a spirit of greed, or to accumulate or add to an already huge fortune, seeks to exploit his fellow Americans, with callous disregard of their physical and spiritual well-being. From the viewpoint of the President, the man who debauches others in order to obtain for himself a high office stands on an evil equality of corruption with the man who debauches others for financial profit. Nothing, again, could be plainer than the allusion to Hearstism in the averment that the plain people who think, the men to whom American traditions are dear, who love their country and try to act decently by their neighbors, owe it to themselves to remember that the most damaging blow which can be dealt to popular government is to elect an unworthy and sinister agitator on a platform of violence and debauchery.

The President's reference to Cuba in his Message has put an end to the impression which, for a time, seems to have been current in Havana, that the provisional Government established by us in that island might be maintained for an indefinite period. On the contrary, Mr. Roosevelt explicitly limits to "a few months" the term during which the provisional Government will administer Cuban affairs. That government will come to an end as soon as a new general election shall have been held, and a new native Administration shall have been inaugurated in peaceful and orderly fashion. At the same time, Mr. Roosevelt warns the Cubans that they must not expect a periodical interposition by the United States for the purpose of restoring order. He adjures them solemnly to weigh their responsibilities, and see to it that, when their new Government is started, it shall run smoothly, free from flagrant denial of right on the one hand, and from insurrectionary disturbances on the other. They may do well to heed his admonition, for he tells them frankly that, if their elections become a farce, and the insurrectionary habit becomes confirmed in their island, it is absolutely out of the question that Cuba should retain independence.

In proposing that the Federal Government shall levy a graduated inheritance tax, the President does not lay himself open to the charge, which he incurs when advocating a Federal income tax, of protesting against the limitations of the Constitution, for the constitutionality of a Federal inheritance tax has been declared by the U. S. Supreme Court. Mr. Roosevelt holds that an inheritance tax should be levied by the Federal Government,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

instead of by the States, because an attempt to impose such a tax in one particular State often results merely in driving the corporation or individual affected to some other State. There is, of course, nothing new about a Federal inheritance tax. Such an impost was first levied as long ago as 1797, when the framers of the Constitution were alive and conducting public affairs. That was a graduated tax, the rate being increased with the amount left to any individual. A similar tax was imposed in 1862, a minimum sum of one thousand dollars in personal property being exempted from taxation, while thereafter the tax became progressive, according to the remoteness of kin. Finally, during our war with Spain, the revenue act of June, 1898, provided for an inheritance tax on any sum exceeding the value of ten thousand dollars, the rate increasing in accordance with the amount left and with the legatee's remoteness of kin.

Conformably to the President's request, the treaty signed at Algeciras was ratified by the Senate in the week ending December 15th, but it was coupled with a resolution, which, in the minds of the other signatories, may cast considerable doubt on the completeness of the ratification. The treaty would not have been ratified without prolonged and strenuous resistance, had not the Senate previously adopted a resolution declaring that, in sanctioning the treaty, it had no purpose of departing from the traditional American foreign policy which forbids participation by the United States in the settlement of political questions entirely European in their scope. In other words, it is the commercial, and not the political, features of the treaty to which our Federal Senate makes the United States a party.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EDITOR'S DIARY.

THURSDAY, *December 13.* Autocracy or Democracy?

WEDNESDAY, December 12th, 1906, will be recorded in history as the day upon which the most audacious Federal Administration the country has yet known announced a deliberate purpose to effect a complete revolution in the form of our Government that has maintained since the thirteen original States embodied their compact in the Constitution of the Union. On the evening of that day, the Secretary of State, the Honorable Elihu Root, addressing the Pennsylvania Society of the City of New York, administered a stinging rebuke to such commonwealths as, in the judgment of the President and himself, had in their legislation disregarded the interests of the whole people, warned them of the danger to their separate authorities which they had thereby incurred, and served upon them formal notice of the intention of the Administration to obtain new constructions of the Constitution which would vitiate the reliance they have hitherto placed upon that instrument as a safeguard of the rights explicitly reserved in Article X of the ratified amendments. It was a memorable and amazing declaration and fraught with possible consequences so momentous and far-reaching that its full import has not yet reached the comprehension of the people.

The thesis of the Secretary of State comprised three separate *dicta* in logical sequence: (1) A marking of the tendency towards absorption of complete authority by a centralized government; (2) Frank admission of further encroachments upon local powers in contemplation by the Administration; and (3) A positive threat to obtain from the highest judicial tribunal, "sooner or later," constructions of the Constitution that will "vest the power where it will be exercised—in the national Government."

Since Alexander Hamilton failed in his final desperate endeavor to deprive the people of what was then considered to be their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inherent right of local self-government, no statesman has ventured hitherto to propose the establishment of concentrated control similar in every practical effect to that which the masses of Russia are at this very day struggling to lift from their stricken land. That there may be no misapprehension of the definite and resolute purpose of the Administration, we present herewith the exact words of the Secretary of State relating to the three broad propositions:

The tendency:—

"It is plainly to be seen that the people of the country are coming to the conclusion that in certain important respects the local laws of the separate States, which were adequate for the due and just regulation and control of the business which was transacted and the activity which began and ended within the limits of the several States, are inadequate for the due and just control of the business and activities which extend throughout all the States, and that power of regulation and control is gradually passing into the hands of the national Government.

"Sometimes by an assertion of the interstate commerce power, sometimes by an assertion of the taxing power, the national Government is taking up the performance of duties which under the changed conditions the separate States are no longer capable of adequately performing. The Federal anti-trust law, the anti-rebate law, the railroad-rate law, the meat-inspection law, the oleomargarine law, the pure-food law, are examples of the purpose of the people of the United States to do through the agency of the national Government the things which the separate State governments formerly did adequately, but no longer do adequately."

That the statutes specified have been enacted into law is undeniable. It is equally certain that those recently passed were driven through the legislative bodies under the whip and spur of the Federal Administration, which did not hesitate to exercise its full power of coercion and bribery through the distribution of patronage to enforce its will upon an obviously reluctant Congress. The disingenuous assertion that the enactment of such laws and the "gradual passing of control into the hands of the national Government" meet with the approval of the sober sense of the people is purely assumptive and finds no confirmation in the reduced Republican membership of the House of Representatives. It is, however, probably true that the fostering and encouragement to growth of a paternalistic spirit by an ebullient Administration have given rise to such a "tend-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ency" among unthinking persons. As to whether the drift is desirable, from the view-point of those who have in mind the future welfare of the country, the Secretary of State expresses no direct opinion. We may only surmise, therefore, whether the Administration's nourishing of such theories is justly attributable to earnest conviction or to mere pandering to mob opinion for the partisan or personal purpose of discomfiting a dangerous rival. Whatever the cause, we may admit the effect.

Further projects mooted:—

"The end is not yet. The process that interweaves the life and action of the people in every section of our country with the people in every other section continues and will continue with increasing force and effect: we are urging forward in a development of business and social life which tends more and more to the obliteration of State lines and the decrease of State power as compared with national power; the relations of the business over which the Federal Government is assuming control, of interstate transportation with State transportation, of interstate commerce with State commerce, are so intimate, and the separation of the two is so impracticable that the tendency is plainly toward the practical control of the national Government over both. New projects of national control are mooted; control of insurance, uniform divorce laws, child-labor laws and many others affecting matters formerly entirely within the cognizance of the State are proposed."

It is somewhat significant that the Secretary of State carefully refrained from fixing the responsibility for further projects of national regulation upon the people; the credit of instigation apparently is desired by an Administration which can perceive no diminution in the force of a tendency created by itself. The attitude is more manly and, if the assumption be correct, no less politic.

The threat:—

"It may be that such control could better be exercised in particular instances by the governments of the States, but the people will have the control they need either from the States or from the national Government, and if the States fail to furnish it in due measure *sooner or later constructions of the Constitution will be found to vest the power where it will be exercised—in the national Government.*"

Constructions of the Constitution are made by the Supreme Court. The justices comprising that august tribunal, designed by the fathers to hold final authority exceeding that of either the Executive or the Congress, are named by the President. One member of the cabinet, in avowed sympathy with the "tendency" noted by the Secretary of State, has just been designated; another,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is well understood, awaits appointment as Chief Justice. A member of the great court nominated by the Chief Magistrate who voted against the contention of the Administration in a famous case was denounced as "disloyal." What are we to infer? That "constructions" of the Constitution "will be found, sooner or later," by justices of purely judicial temperament, bent solely upon correct interpretation, or by mere prejudiced puppets of the Executive arm of the Government? Having in mind the "constructive recess" of the Senate between the midnight ticks of the clock "found" by the present Secretary of State; not forgetting the subtle device by which the Administration, in flagrant violation of the treaty-making prerogative vested in the Senate, achieved and still maintains its will in San Domingo; holding fast in recollection the virtual declaration of war by inciting insurrection against Colombia; still sadly recalling the denunciation, as "wickedly absurd," of the action of American parents in refusing to admit grown Mongolians into intimate association with their little children, and a threat to employ, if necessary, "all of the forces, military and civil, of the United States" to enforce such hateful contact—are we justified in expecting that the "constructions" of the Constitution to be "found" will be precise interpretations, or must we apprehensively look forward to a succession of evasions and subversions?

"It is useless," declared the Secretary of State, "for the advocate of State rights to inveigh against the supremacy of the constitutional laws of the United States." This is worse than disingenuous; it is purely demagogic—the contemptible building of a man of straw. As the Secretary of State and his chief well know, nobody has inveighed against either the supremacy or application of "constitutional laws"; it is the adroit, avowed and, to our mind, unpatriotic and almost treasonable challenge of our fundamental law that evokes condemnation. It is also "useless," according to the Secretary of State, to inveigh "against the extension of national authority in the fields of necessary control." Against *constitutional* extension of such authority? No. To *that* there is no objection. It is the admittedly *unconstitutional* extension that makes for apprehension; that is, admittedly unconstitutional until "constructions" shall be "found." When, if ever, that sinister prophecy shall have come to pass, there will be no occasion to stand steadfastly for or inveigh against a Con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stitution that will have become as dead as the laws of Medes and Persians.

It is pitiful to feel compelled to speak truth that is bitter. We yield to none in appreciation of the excellent intentions, despite the calculating quality of his methods, of Theodore Roosevelt. We hailed him originally as the only apparent saviour of the country from the inordinate greed of his party as represented in and controlled by the Senate. In common, we believe, with a vast majority of his fellow citizens, we have regarded with patient tolerance his numberless impulsive indiscretions, even to the recent humiliating diplomatic episode and the ridiculous attempt to effect by quasi-imperial decree a change in established form of expression. Even his latest impatient demand for the privilege of regarding all officers of the army and navy in time of peace as in a class with his household servants and subject to dishonorable discharge without necessary trial or cause, but from caprice or personal disfavor, we took lightly because of the belief, which we still entertain, that even a benumbed Congress will not endow the President of a free people with a personal authority held by no king, emperor or tsar of any civilized nation. Until now it has seemed no more than a patriotic duty to overlook lapses and deficiencies which might, after all, prove to have been immaterial in connection with a zealous endeavor to achieve the greatest good for the greatest number.

Yet stronger has been our sense of admiration and appreciation of the Secretary of State—an unquestionably great man, whose splendid service has not had and now, in our judgment, never will have, full requital. Of all minds composing this restive Administration, his at least was reckoned calm; and yet, such apparently has been the effect of the glamour of almost royal honors rendered and accepted in foreign lands, supplemented by the impressions of regal splendor conveyed by the first of American Cæsars to visit in suitable state his outlying provinces, that from the very lips of that sagacious man we receive the pronouncement, insulting to a free people, of empire.

It is not a matter of the rights of States, in spite of the fact that the Union was and is no more than a compact for mutual protection and helpfulness of sovereign bodies politic; all recognize the indubitable fact that changing conditions require elastic

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

adjustment of governmental jurisdiction. The question confronting the American people, following the defiance hurled by the President and Secretary of State, is simply and solely whether the Constitution is indeed the bulwark of our liberties depicted by the great Chief Justice or a mere shuttlecock in the game of politics to be tossed back and forth by a new autocracy, itself surely doomed, in turn, to be engulfed in the yawning abyss of anarchy. It is the fate, not of an individual commonwealth, but of the Republic itself, that trembles in the balance.

FRIDAY, *December 14.* A Christmas Plea for Vanity.

WE question whether Solomon actually wrote or dictated the words of the preacher; it seems far more likely that, in his old age, he let his moody spirit feed upon the shrewdly pessimistic philosophy of his courtiers, and himself became the editor of epigrammatic phrases most favored, if sardonic. "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity," is the expression, not of wisdom, but of folly —a weak admission of spiritual depression unworthy of a strong character or even a trained intellect. In other books comprising the Old Testament the word, subsequently translated into the Latin *vanitas* and now into the Esperanto *vaneco,* signified a heathen god or personification of vice; but, clearly, in Ecclesiastes it was used to represent mere emptiness, indicating the futility of endeavor, as, for example, Cooper poetically defined death as reducing all to the same views of the "vanity of life," and Poe mournfully bewailed

> "—the hollow and high-sounding vanities
> Of the populous Earth!"

As, of course, we all know, the accepted meaning of the word changed long ago; precisely when, we cannot tell, but certainly before the frankest of philosophers argued that it was less vain than immodest in a man to speak freely of himself. To-day our latest, revised and professedly up-to-date dictionaries define vanity as (1) "a feeling of shallow pride, especially as characteristic and demonstrative, and as manifesting an overweening desire to attract notice and gain admiration in a small way on slight grounds"; (2) "mental elation arising from a high opinion of one's own attainments or achievements, or from an overestimation of possessions more showy than valuable," and (3) "inordinate self-esteem." The third interpretation we reject as an encroach-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment upon the prerogatives of egotism and conceit; the first and second we accept as exact in the modern sense, and from that viewpoint we insist that the trait has undergone serious misrepresentation.

Vanity, as we and our modern dictionaries comprehend it, is not displeasing in manifestation. King Solomon himself would not have resented a natural effort upon the part of a child "to attract notice and gain attention in a small way on slight grounds"; though wise, he was intensely human, as we could readily demonstrate from his autobiography, and he would have entered sympathetically into the spirit of the future woman joyously exhibiting her bows of pink and blue. Moreover, while of course only well-to-do as compared with our own modern billionaires or multi-millionaires, he nevertheless possessed much gold and silver, to say nothing of an aggregation of concubines difficult of acquirement in these hypercritical days, and could appreciate the naturalness of "mental elation arising from an overestimation of possessions." And so, despite the disparity in the possession of worldly goods, can we or any fitly constructed person. An exhibition of vanity on the part of one unduly rich is but normal and no more offensive than a similar manifestation by a happy child. Even having the power, to deprive either the one or the other of the harmless personal enjoyment arising therefrom would be a surly performance, incompatible with the spirit which should predominate during the celebration of Christ's mass.

Christmas week is the time of all the year when blessings from the heart fall most bountifully upon the vast majority of humankind who work to live. To those who have so much that the most shrewdly selected gift can but add to a hopeless surfeit it is a season of comparative bitterness. They are the ones, then, most immediately in need of sympathetic commiseration, and for them, on this eve of the celebration of the Nativity, we bespeak the kindly feeling of all good people and gentle tolerance of vanities inseparable from great possessions.

SATURDAY, *December 15.* Where Stands England?

FAR be it from us to suggest that the English are stupid; we cheerily admit the validity of their own oft-repeated assertion that their notable success as a nation forbids the use in a truthful sense of such a characterization. But we must confess that there

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

do come times, at rare intervals, when we are puzzled by what seems to be on their part a certain lack of comprehension of realities. This is one of those times. We are informed that they are distressed at the moment by our apparently increasing indisposition to respond, with the enthusiasm which with a certain amount of complacency they feel a right to expect from impulsive natures, to their undisguised manifestations of true friendliness. Such an attitude on our part is to their minds inexplicable, especially in view of their adulatory regard for our Chief Magistrate, whose people they have come to consider we are, as the Germans are the Kaiser's.

In the circumstances, we suppose, it is but natural that they should attach exceptional importance to the personal equation and attribute the condition they deplore to comparatively inefficient representation in Washington. Hence the difficulty and delay, we are informed, in filling the post of Ambassador about to be vacated by Sir Mortimer Durand. Nobody can be found who meets the apparent requirements of our many-sided President. James Bryce was suggested; but alas! while unquestionably holding to an exceptional degree the good-will of our people, he is, after all, only a statesman and a scholar, and wholly unversed in the noble game of tennis practised so happily on the White House courts by the Ambassador from the French Republic. Lord Curzon, too, demonstrated extraordinary capacity as Governor-General of India, and is well and favorably known in this country, in a personal sense, as one of the few titled foreigners who have proven satisfactory husbands of American wives, but he cannot ride as far or shoot as straight as the clever representative of the Kaiser. Opinion now seems to be setting strongly in favor of Lord Desborough, "the strong man of Taplow," who has shot in India, Africa and the Rockies, has rowed across the English Channel, has swum the Niagara River, and throws a beautiful fly. It may happen that, in final consideration, a bar to his appointment will be found; but, in any case, solemnly declares a prominent English journal, "What we required when the retiring envoy was appointed and what we need now is a man as little like a professional diplomat as possible." Upon this assumption, the quest will proceed. If, finally, one shall be found capable of participating with our President in the strenuous joys of physical existence, great will be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

our gratification; for, surely, none stands in severer need of constant relaxation than he.

Nevertheless, we cannot rid our mind of the thought that there are other considerations, to which now, in a spirit of helpful suggestion towards our cousins, we venture to advert. Despite the stern pronouncement of the President that the refusal of citizens of San Francisco to permit grown-up Mongolians to attend the same schools where their own little girls and boys are taught is "wickedly absurd," the incident is not yet closed, and a happy settlement of the difficulty seems no nearer. We by no means share the opinion freely expressed on the Continent that a cause so trifling may lead to warfare between Japan and the United States; and yet we cannot ignore the possibility of serious trouble arising from an accumulation of irritating, and perhaps unavoidable, circumstances in the future. In such a deplorable event, we are constrained to reflect what would be the attitude towards us of Great Britain. Japan is her ally for better or for worse, without apparent regard to right, wrong or expediency. The terms of the alliance are succinctly stated in the treaty executed by the two high contracting parties on August 12th, 1905, in these words:

"Article II.—Should either of the high contracting parties be involved in war in defence of its territorial rights or special interests, the other party will at once come to the assistance of its ally, and both parties will conduct a war in common and make peace in mutual agreement with any power or powers involved in such war."

We may safely assume that, as a matter of practice if not of theory, Japan will never have occasion to resist an American invasion of its territorial rights, even though she should continue, as she has begun, to deliberately violate her pledge of an "open door" for trade in Manchuria. Whether or not such a claim as her Government sets up respecting the equal rights of her students in San Francisco comes within the purview of "special interests" is a question. Undoubtedly, that is the Japanese view, and we are deeply impressed by the fact that it is taken for granted by the eminent publicist whose authoritative judgment is expressed upon the pages of this REVIEW. True, Mr. Hazeltine surmises that the English people, for purely selfish reasons, would estop their Government from joining in such a war upon the United States, and he cites some precedents in support of his theory;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but the fact remains that, if brought face to face with the situation, Great Britain would be compelled to turn against us the full force of her great navy in response to a demand from Japan or flagrantly violate a solemn treaty obligation.

We readily admit that the assumption of an obligation so menacing to the United States was inadvertent on the part of the British Government. At the time of the execution of the treaty —during the Peace Conference at Portsmouth—the possibility of war between Japan and the United States was not within the range of contemplation, and the agreement was framed solely for the purpose of safeguarding mutual interests against Continental aggression. But it is idle now to maintain that such a contingency can be ignored. If, therefore, England would convince us of the sincerity of her professions of friendship, it is plainly evident that she should lose no time in rectifying an error, even though such error be justly attributed to inadvertence rather than to deliberation. It is not likely that Japan would be so obstinate as to refuse consent to an immediate modification of the treaty, excepting from the operation of the main provision her ally's chief source of food-supply. Whether or not His Majesty's Government, from the view-point of policy, shall consider it wise to make a diplomatic attempt to effect such a change is a question for them to decide; but there is no escape from the fact that, so long as the expressed obligation continues in force, England is, theoretically at least, in a position of willingness to be forced to make war upon the United States at the instigation of another Power. Obviously, continuance in that position is hopelessly incompatible with friendly professions, and, we say plainly, it will soon come to be regarded in this country as a wilful and serious menace to our security and welfare as a Nation.

Our earnest suggestion, therefore, to our brothers by race and lineage, towards whom, we beg to assure them, there now exist in this country only the most kindly feelings, is to turn for a moment from their search for a congenial companion for the President to the more imminent necessity of setting themselves right before the eyes of the American people.

MONDAY, *December 17.* **The Conquest of the Air.**

IT is eminently fitting that the conquest of the air, which now seems assured, should crown the achievements of this creative age.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

None, if indeed all combined, of the wonderful inventions of the past century has wrought so many and so radical changes in the conditions of physical existence or is laden with such a variety of possibilities as this final mastery of the atmosphere. Long before the days of Darius Green there had appeared at intervals signs of success, only, however, to share the fate of the famous flying-machine itself; but now evidences of the solution of the physical problem that has most puzzled man from the beginning are convincing. Far more important than the guiding of balloons was the recent actual flight of Mr. Santos-Dumont's aëroplane, a motor air-ship buoyed by flat surfaces corresponding to the wings of a bird, for a distance of two hundred and thirty yards. Other inventors claim to have achieved more, but in private, while this experiment was in public, and the result, proving that a body heavier than the air itself could be forced through it by mechanical power, was conclusive; it remains only to lighten engines, strengthen other parts and generally perfect the machine.

But Mr. Santos-Dumont's success involved more than this mere demonstration; it chained public attention forthwith and brought forth money for experimentation and reward which had not hitherto been forthcoming. A Paris newspaper began by offering a prize of £4,000, which was increased by public subscription to £10,000, to the winner of an air-ship race from Paris to London in 1908; a London journal promptly offered £10,000 for the first flight from London to Manchester; other similar proposals have been made in both countries; and landowners have offered the free use of estates most suitable for experiment; so that Mr. Santos-Dumont's expectation that the prize for the London-Manchester flight will be won next year seems not unreasonable.

Accepting, as we must, the navigation of the air as a question only of time, what will happen when it becomes an accomplished fact? That the new system will possess some advantages over all existing means of transportation is obvious, having what might be termed plain sailing at times, and always immunity from the burdensome cost of road-beds, bridges and the like. In the matter of speed, too, it is well known that certain birds fly twice as rapidly as the fastest express train; why not the aëroplane, built upon the same principle? In respect to competition with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other methods of transportation, however, we opine that owners of securities of existing transportation companies need feel no apprehension. The street-car did not succumb to the elevated, the elevated to the subway, the horse to the motor, the telegraph to the telephone, nor the cable to the wireless. This growing world seems to require all facilities as rapidly as they can be supplied by the genius of man, and each addition, apparently, seems only to aid, rather than to cripple, the others, in consonance with the familiar saying of railway men that travel makes travel—that is, individual examples form a communal habit.

But what of regulations making for safety not only of passengers in the air, but of those over whose heads the air-ship must sail? In view of the difficulty experienced in the restraint of motor-cars on land, where at least they can be numbered, located and stopped, the employment of winged angels or demons as policeman would seem likely to be requisite to the maintenance of speed regulations in the sky and to the protection of the heads of people on the planet. Whether any considerable number of persons, any number, at least, of sufficient size to give commercial value to aëro-transportation, will ever utilize the method, is doubtful. It seems unnatural; apparently man was built to stand upon the ground. Strife against the force of gravity, therefore, may be regarded as contrary to the intention of the creating power; a fact which may account for the intense dislike and even fear of the majority of men and women on looking down from a great height. For this reason alone it is certain that the percentage of inhabitants of the earth who would now hazard a trip through the air is infinitesimally small. And yet a similar prejudice once prevailed against sailing on the seas; and those who climb steeples and work on high buildings seem to have demonstrated that even the distressing dizziness experienced by most of us yields readily to the potent influence of familiarity; so we really can tell very little about it, and, despite the example of the rapidity of the development, once begun, of steam and electricity, we question whether in many generations there will be reason for serious concern.

Nations are more immediately concerned than individuals. Visionary may have seemed—and, perhaps, may still seem—the anticipations of the poet, when, peering into the future far as human eye could see, in imagination he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Saw the heavens fill with commerce, argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down with costly bales;
Heard the heavens fill with shouting, and there rained a ghastly dew
From the nations' airy navies grappling in the central blue."

But even now, in war, dirigible balloons are employed. True, the air battle-ship is not readily imagined; and yet—apart from possible engagements of aërial fleets—a very small navigable aëroplane could take aloft a sufficient amount of highly explosive material to demolish a small city like New York or London. Fortunately, however, British writers have already settled in their minds that a Berne Convention will precede the fighting air-ship and limit the scope of its work, but in just what manner the heavens will be patrolled for the capture of pirates has not yet been made clear. Perhaps the necessity will not arise.

TUESDAY, *December 18.* Good Women a Majority.

"All women must be enfranchised or none, and the prospect is not alluring."—*The New York Times.*

ARE there more bad women than good women in the United States? We may safely assume that such is not the contention of this distinguished journal. The "unalluring prospect," more explicitly stated, would be found to rest upon the familiar assumption that bad women will vote and good women will not vote, and that, therefore, the net effect must be injurious. There lies before us a report of the results of an inquiry into this phase of the subject in the four suffrage States. Direct questions were addressed to the judges of the Supreme Courts and presidents of universities and colleges, and the summaries presented herewith rest upon the answers received:

Kansas.—"Although women do not have full suffrage in Kansas, they have voted in municipal elections since 1887 and in school elections ever since Kansas has been a State. So their forty-five years of experience is valuable. The votes of immoral women have not appreciably influenced elections in that State. Abandoned women do not care to vote, or register, or come in contact with good women at the polls. Consequently, they rarely register if left alone.

"There have been men, however, who attempted to make use of their ballots. In the early years of municipal woman suffrage in Kansas a candidate in a place of 8,000 population fancied that he could make his election sure by the support of the immoral women of the city, and he did secure it. He promised them protection and certain immunities, and won them to his support. As soon as the respectable women of the city

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

heard of it, they organized to defeat him, and it was not at all hard to do. That class of women have cut no figure in Kansas elections since that experience.

"In Leavenworth, a candidate for Mayor once had the hardihood to flaunt immoral women in a procession of carriages going to the polls, expecting thus to disgust decent women with the exercise, and so induce them to remain away from the polls. But these only came out the more and taught candidates that the votes of immoral women would drive support from those who sought success at the hands of the degraded class of women voters. Candidates are now extremely anxious to keep that sort of support out of sight, but it cannot be done because these women *must register*, and close watch is kept on the registration. It is very soon known if immoral women are preparing to vote in any considerable numbers."

Utah.—"In the larger centres of population in Utah immoral women have been made use of by the saloon element to try to influence the elections, but without any appreciable effect."

Idaho.—"A good many immoral women vote, probably a majority, and their votes are cast for that which is evil if an opportunity be afforded; but the system under which they are enabled to vote has such a beneficial influence upon politics that the effect of their ballots is lost. Immoral men and immoral women both vote, and the votes of both are bad. But the votes of moral women raise the average of character represented by the ballots cast. There are so many more good women than good men that the system is highly advantageous, notwithstanding the fact that immoral women cast ballots for bad candidates. A far greater proportion of good women than of good men can be relied upon to vote for the right on questions involving moral principles. In the flood of good ballots which this gives, the bad ones are submerged."

Wyoming.—"The Wyoming Secretary of State, in a letter, says that ninety per cent. of the women of Wyoming vote, and ex-Governor Warren, of Wyoming, adds: 'Our women nearly all vote; and since, in Wyoming as elsewhere, the majority of women are good and not bad, the results are good and not evil.'"

Several years ago a statement was published that the women of Colorado voted in large numbers, and that their vote was "noticeably more conscientious than that of men." It was signed by the Governor, Governor-elect, the two ex-Governors of Colorado, by the Chief Justice and all the judges of the Supreme Court, the Denver District Court, and the Court of Appeals; by the president of the State University, the president of the Colorado College, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Attorney-General, and all the Colorado Senators and Representatives in Congress, the Mayor of Denver, and a large number of prominent citizens, including eminent clergymen of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

different denominations. The results of the past two years we summarized in the last number of this REVIEW. There remains to be added the testimony of Judge Lindsay of the famous Juvenile Court, who says:

"Woman suffrage in Colorado for over ten years has more than demonstrated its justice. No one would dare to propose its repeal; and, if left to the men of the State, any proposition to revoke the right bestowed upon women would be overwhelmingly defeated.

"Many good laws have been obtained in Colorado which would not have been secured but for the power and influence of women.

"At some of the elections in Denver frauds have been committed. Ninety-nine per cent. of these frauds were committed by men, without any connivance or assistance, direct or indirect, from women; but because one per cent. were committed by women, there are ignorant or careless-minded people in other States who actually argue that this is the reason for denying women the right to vote. If it were a just reason for denying suffrage to women, it would be ten times greater reason for denying it to men.

"People have no right to judge woman suffrage in Colorado by the election frauds in a few precincts, unless it would be to show why suffrage should be denied to men and restricted to women. As a matter of fact, the only blow for decency that counted in the last of a series of bad elections in Denver, was delivered by women voters; and the very important good that came out of an otherwise questionable election was the result of woman suffrage. The evil results of that election were in spite of woman suffrage; not because of it, but because of male suffrage; for had there been no men who voted at that election, and if the matter had been left entirely to women, not a corruptionist would have been elected."

Such we believe to be the facts. The reasons why prostitutes dislike to go to the polls in the broad light of day are sufficiently obvious; the last remaining pang of shame springs from contact with or proximity to chastity; it is, therefore, avoided at the polls as everywhere else. We now regard the carelessly repeated rumor of "failure of woman suffrage in Colorado" as refuted with sufficient authority to leave no room for doubt in any fair mind.

The fact that it is "in spite of, not because of," women voting that all results are not satisfactory is fully emphasized by Justice Lindsay's further statement that an effort to withdraw the franchise would be overwhelmingly defeated by men's votes alone. Is not this invariably the case? Has the privilege of voting once bestowed upon women ever been revoked?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WEDNESDAY, *December 19.* Let Those Who Wed Put Asunder!

WE must regard the President's declaration that "the whole question of marriage and divorce should be relegated to the authority of the National Congress," not as a definitive official recommendation, but as a mere expression of personal opinion. Being "aware of the difficulty" of enacting a constitutional amendment, however generally desired, he must recognize that in this case the difficulty amounts to virtual impossibility. Theoretically, each State is satisfied with its laws relating to divorce as they now stand; and, practically, despite appreciation of the evils resulting from diversity of regulations, probably not one-fourth, and surely not the requisite three-fourths, of the States could be induced to relinquish authority to the Federal Congress. It is inconceivable, for example, that South Carolina, which prohibits divorcement entirely, or New York, which concedes but the one cause, infidelity, would blindly expunge the existing statutes in favor of others to be made by representatives of sister States holding quite different views. Nor, on the other hand, can we suppose that South Dakota would readily submit to the dictation of South Carolina or New York. It is idle, therefore, to discourse upon either the probable advantages or disadvantages of national legislation, and far more to the point to seek a remedy that may be practicable, even if only partial. One sensible suggestion has been made, to the effect that the real need "is not a general law providing what shall be the causes for an absolute divorce in all parts of the country, but the adoption by the several States of a general rule which shall prohibit the courts of the State from granting any divorce except in cases where the defendant is an actual resident of the State, or has been served with process within the territorial limits of the State." We are disposed to think that a simpler and more efficacious method would be the adoption of a general rule prescribing that only the State by whose authority two persons are wed shall thereafter put them asunder. The divorcement of a couple then by any State other than that wherein they were married would not be recognized in commonwealths subscribing to the rule, so that in practical effect an attempt on the part of one, two or half a dozen small States to maintain the present advantages of a Gretna Green would be futile.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ESPERANTO.

THE introductory lessons in Esperanto which we print in the following pages by arrangement with the British Esperanto Association, were compiled by Dr. J. C. O'Connor and other Fellows of the Association expressly for enquirers and beginners. They are by no means a compendium of the language, but nevertheless a person of average intelligence, whether or not he has ever studied foreign languages, will be enabled, by means of these lessons, to acquire a serviceable reading and speaking knowledge of that remarkable language, already described in this REVIEW.

In the present number we publish the first instalment of the lessons together with a vocabulary which will serve for these as well as for the subsequent primary lessons. Once the primary lessons have been mastered, we shall from time to time print other, more advanced lessons, embracing the grammatical and practical as well as the literary side of the language.

Many of our readers will no doubt address questions to us, which we shall aim to elucidate in these pages. We shall, moreover, present graded selections in the best Esperanto prose and verse from the classics of the various literatures as well as from modern writers. Our purpose, in short, will be to give our readers a thoroughgoing course in Esperanto.

The following hints will be found of service by the student: Wherever possible two or more persons should study together. Esperanto is meant to be a spoken language; by reading aloud (not shrinkingly, but distinctly) and by conversation, how elementary soever, the ear will get that training which is essential in the study of any living language. Once the first few grammatical rules are mastered, the student should proceed to the exercise following, read it aloud, and then translate it into English. If two or more study together, simple interrogative sentences can be formed with the interrogative particle *Ĉu* and answered either with the same words or, better still, with an additional word or phrase in order to enhance the interest. We do not recommend translating the student's English translations back into Esperanto for the present. Too early attempts may

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

confuse the student. Of course, many of our readers may be trained linguists, and therefore not in need of this advice. We need scarcely say that it is not to them these remarks are addressed.

ESPERANTO GRAMMAR.

The Alphabet consists of 28 letters, viz.:—

A	B	C	Ĉ	D	E	F
G	Ĝ	H	Ĥ	I	J	Ĵ
K	L	M	N	O	P	R
S	Ŝ	T	U	Ŭ	V	Z

With the exception of the following, these are pronounced as in English:—

c	as	*ts*	in its.	ĉ	as *ch* in chat.
g	"	*g*	" gag.	ĝ	" *g* " gem.
j	"	*y*	" yes.	ĵ	" *s* " leisure.
s	"	*s*	" basin.	ĥ	" *ch* " loch.
z	"	*z*	" zone.	ŝ	" *sh* " show.
a	"	*a*	" Pa.	aŭ	" *ow* " now.
e	"	*e*	" there.	aj	" *y* " my.
i	"	*e*	" me.	oj	" *o y* " so young.
o	"	*o*	" storm.	ej	" *ay y* " say yes.
u	"	*oo*	" too.	uj	" *ue y* " blue yarn.

Remember, Esperanto is strictly phonetic. One letter, one sound. No silent letters.

Tiu=tee-oo.	*Tute* =too-tay.
Iel =ee-ale.	*Neniu*=nay-nee-oo.
Io =ee-oh.	*Traire*=trah-ee-ray.

Accent.—The stress is always on the last syllable but one.

Compound words are formed as in English.

Antaŭ, before.	*Vidi,* to see.	*Antaŭvidi,* to foresee.
Vaporo, steam.	*Ŝipo,* ship.	*Vaporŝipo,* steamship.

International words, that is, words common to most European languages, are changed only in this, they are subject to the orthographic rules of the Language.

Anatomio, anatomy.	*Mikrofono,* microphone.
Analizo, analysis.	*Naturo,* nature.
Mikrobo, microbe.	*Teatro,* theatre.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SYNOPSIS OF GRAMMAR.

Nouns	end in	*-o.*
Adjectives	"	*-a.*
Plurals	"	*-j.*
Direct object	"	*-n.*
Adverbs (derived)	"	*-e.*
Infinitive mood	"	*-i.*
Present tense of verbs	"	*-as.*
Past tense of verbs	"	*-is.*
Future tense of verbs	"	*-os.*
Conditional mood	"	*-us.*
Imperative-subjunctive	"	*-u.*
Present participle (active)	"	*-anta.*
Past participle "	"	*-inta.*
Future participle "	"	*-onta.*
Present participle (passive)	"	*-ata.*
Past participle "	"	*-ita.*
Future participle "	"	*-ota.*

There are no exceptions and no irregular verbs.

Esperanto being a root-language, you can build up your own words by adding the above endings to a root. Thus:—

Labor', root word for "labor."
Labor-o, labour (noun).
Labor-a, laborious (adjective).
Labor-e, laboriously (adverb).
Labor-i, to labor (verb).

By adding the verbal endings (*as, is, os,* etc.) the process can be further extended.

Mi labor-as, I work, I do work.
Mi labor-is, I worked, I did work.
Mi labor-os, I shall (or, will) work.
Mi labor-us, I should (or would) work.

And by means of the Prefixes and Suffixes (see lessons) this process of word-building can be further extended easily and naturally.

Labor-ej-*o,* a workshop.
Labor-ist-*o,* a workman.
Labor-ist-in-*o,* a workwoman.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GRAMMAR.—LESSON I.

Article.—There is no indefinite article (a, an). *Frato,* a brother. *Onklo,* an uncle.

The definite article *la* (the) is invariable. *La patro,* the father. *La kuzoj,* the cousins.

Noun.—In the singular all nouns end in *-o.* In the plural they end in *-oj.* *Dom-o,* house. *Dom-oj,* houses.

Adjective.—In the singular adjectives end in *-a.* Plurals end in *-aj.*

Bon-a filo, a good son.
La riĉ-a nevo, the rich nephew.
La jun-aj nepoj, the young grandsons.
If the noun is plural (*-oj*) the adjective which qualifies it takes the sign (*-aj*) of the plural.

Verb.—The *infinitive* of verbs ends in *-i.* *Skrib-i,* to write. *Est-i,* to be. *Kant-i,* to sing.

The *present* tense of verbs ends in *-as.*
Li parol-as, he speaks (or, does speak).
Ŝi kant-as, she sings (or, is singing).

The *past* tense of verbs ends in *-is.*
La infano plor-is, the child wept (or, did weep).
Ni promenad-is, we walked (or, were walking).

Interrogation.—*Ĉu* denotes a question when no other interrogative word, such as *kie?* where? *kiam?* when? *kial?* why? etc., is used.

Ĉu la birdo kantas? Does the bird sing?
Ĉu Petro legis? Did (or, has) Peter read?
Ĉu li alvenis? Did he arrive?
Ĉu vi dancos? Will you dance?

Prefixes and Suffixes.—*Mal* (prefix) denotes opposites.

Varma, warm. *Mal-varma,* cold.
Fermi, to close. *Mal-fermi,* to open.

In (suffix) denotes feminines.
Patro, father. *Patr-in-o,* mother.
Edzo, husband. *Edz-in-o,* wife.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EXERCISE I.

La patro estas en[1] la ĝardeno[2] kaj[3] la patrino estas en la ĉambro.[4] Kie[5] estas la patro? Ĉu estas la patrino en la ĝardeno? Ne,[6] sinjoro,[7] ŝi[8] estas en la dormoĉambro.[9] La filo[10] estas juna. La filinoj estas maljunaj. La juna knabo[11] estas tre[12] atenta,[13] sed[14] la knabinoj estas malatentaj. Kiu[15] kantis hieraŭ[16] en la teatro?[17] Mi[18] ne scias,[19] sinjorino. Tiu[20] domo estas bela,[21] tiu ĉi[22] domo ne estas bela kaj la domoj de mia[23] onklino estas malbelaj. La reĝo[24] estas saĝa[25] kaj prudenta.[26] La reĝino estas juna kaj bela. Iu[27] estas en la domo. Neniu[28] estas en la ĉambro. Ĉiu[29] estas en la ĝardeno. Ŝi estas riĉa. Ŝi ne estas riĉa. Ĉu ŝi estas riĉa? Ĉu ŝi ne estas riĉa? Tiuj[30] homoj[31] estas junaj, sed tiuj ĉi[32] estas maljunaj. Kiam[33] ŝi skribis? Kial[34] li parolis? Kie estas la frato? Kiu estas en la ĉambro?

1 in. 2 garden. 3 and. 4 room. 5 where. 6 no, not. 7 Mr., sir. 8 she. 9 bedroom. 10 son. 11 boy. 12 very. 13 attentive. 14 but. 15 who. 16 yesterday. 17 theatre. 18 I. 19 to know. 20 that. 21 beautiful. 22 this. 23 my. 24 king. 25 wise. 26 sensible. 27 some one. 28 no one. 29 each. 30 those. 31 men. 32 these. 33 when. 34 why.

In these notes the infinitive of the verb is given.

Pri la Vojo[1]:—Sinjoro, ĉu vi povas[2] direkti min al la stacidomo[3]? Jes, fraŭlino, prenu la duan straton[4] maldekstren.[5] Ĉu ĝi estas malproksime[6]? Ne, nur kelkajn[7] paŝojn.[8] Mi volas iri al la Muzeo, ĉu vi povas direkti min? Certe, ĉu vi volas piediri[9] aŭ veturi omnibuse[10]? Volante rigardi[11] la butikojn,[12] mi preferas piediri. Ĉu vi konas[13] S^ron. B. kiu loĝas[14] ie[15] sur tiu ĉi strato? Kiu[16] estas lia numero? Ĉu vi konas bonan restoracion,[17] ne tro[18] karprezan[19]? Mi povas[20] rekomendi hotelon kie vi povas loĝi, ĝi estas tre bona kaj ne tro karpreza (dear).

1 the way, road. 2 can. 3 railway station. 4 street. 5 to the left. 6 far. 7 a few. 8 steps. 9 to go on foot. 10 by omnibus. 11 to look at. 12 shops. 13 to know. 14 to reside. 15 somewhere. 16 what. 17 restaurant. 18 too. 19 dear. 20 can.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GRAMMAR.—LESSON II.

Noun (*Accusative*).—The noun which is the direct object of a transitive verb adds *-n* to the singular and plural.

Johano havas libron, John has a book.
Mi perdis la florojn, I lost the flowers.

And when an adjective qualifies such a noun, it also takes this final *-n* (singular and plural).

Johano havas novan libron, John has a new book.
Mi perdis la novajn librojn, I lost the new books.

Adjectives are compared by *pli* (more, -er) for the Comparative and by *plej* (most, -est) for the Superlative.

Mi estas riĉa, vi estas pli riĉa, li estas la plej riĉa.
I am rich, you are richer, he is the richest.
Tiel—kiel, as—as. *Ol,* than. *Tre,* very.
Li estas tiel riĉa kiel vi, he is as rich as you.
Ŝi estas pli diligenta ol vi.
She is more diligent than you.
Vi estas tre brava, you are very brave.

Adverbs are formed by adding *-e* to the root.
Ŝaĝ-e, wisely. *Rapid-e,* quickly. *Bon-e,* well.
Li agis saĝe, he acted wisely.
They are compared like adjectives.

Verb.—The *future* tense ends in *-os.*
Mi est-os, I shall be. *Li am-os,* he will love.
Ili aĉet-os la libron, they will buy the book.

Prefixes.—Re (prefix) denotes again, back.
Doni, to give. *Re-doni,* to give back.
Re-brili, to reflect.

Bo (prefix) denotes relatives by marriage.
Filo, son. *Bo-filo,* son-in-law.
Patro, father. *Bo-patro,* father-in-law.

Ge denotes persons of both sexes taken together.
Ge-filoj, son(s) and daughter(s).
Ge-edzoj, husband and wife.
Ge-mastroj, master and mistress.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EXERCISE II.

Li[1] aĉetis novan ĉapelon.[2] Mi trovis[3] belan libron sur la strato.[4] Ili[5] havas belajn florojn. Ĉu vi[6] redonos la ĵurnalojn[7] al la bofilo? Mi ne estas tute[8] certa.[9] Ĉu vi ricevis[10] leteron[11] hodiaŭ[12]? Jes,[13] mi ricevis leteron de mia bopatro kaj poŝtkartojn[14] de miaj gefratoj. Kie loĝas[15] viaj gepatroj? Ili loĝas en Londono, ili reiros[16] al Parizo[17] en la somero.[18] Henriko estas atenta, Petro estas pli atenta sed Paŭlo estas la plej atenta el[19] ĉiuj.[20] La soldatoj[21] batalis[22] brave[23] sed vane.[24] Li dormis[25] pace.[26] Vi legas tro[27] malrapide. Io[28] estas sur[29] la tablo. Li trovis ion en la valizo.[30] Kio[31] estas sur la tablo? Estas[32] nenio,[33] sinjoro. Kion vi trovis? Mi trovis nenion. Ĉu estas ĉio[34] preta[35]? Ĉio estas tute preta. Kion vi perdis? Mi perdis nenion, sed li perdis ĉion. Ĉu vi aĉetos la libron? Ĉu vi ne aĉetos la librojn?

1 he. 2 hat. 3 to find. 4 street. 5 they. 6 you. 7 newspaper. 8 quite. 9 certain. 10 to receive. 11 letter. 12 to-day. 13 yes. 14 post card. 15 to reside. 16 to go back. 17 Paris. 18 summer. 19 (out) of. 20 all. 21 soldier. 22 fought. 23 bravely. 24 vainly. 25 to sleep. 26 peaceably. 27 too. 28 something. 29 on. 30 valise. 31 what (thing). 32 there is. 33 nothing. 34 everything. 35 ready.

Pri la Vojaĝo[1]:—Lundon[2] lastan ni preparis por vojaĝi.[3] La portisto[4] forportis[5] niajn pakaĵojn.[6] Ni iris al la stacidomo piede. La vagonaro[7] estis forironta je la naŭa horo, sed ĝi estis malfrua[8] dek minutojn. Mi prenis mian bileton[9] *por iro kaj reveno.*[10] Mi metis[11] mian valizon en angulon,[12] kaj ĉar la vagonaro rapidege iris ni estis terure skuataj.[13] Post trairo de la tunelo, oni ĝuas[14] belegan vidaĵon,[15] sed oni iras tiel rapide ke la belaj pejzaĝoj[16] ne estas videblaj. Fine ni alvenis[17] en Londonon.

1 journey. 2 Monday. 3 to travel. 4 the porter. 5 took away. 6 luggage. 7 train. 8 late. 9 ticket. 10 return. 11 to put. 12 corner. 13 to shake. 14 to enjoy. 15 prospect. 16 landscape. 17 to arrive.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GRAMMAR.—LESSON III.

Pronouns.—The personal pronouns are:—

Mi, I, *Li,* he, *Ŝi,* she, *Ĝi,* it, *Ni,* we, *Vi,* you.

Ili, they, *Oni* (indefinite), one, they, we, people, it.

Si (reflexive), used for third person only.

Pronouns (accusative) take final *-n* like nouns.

Mi vidis lin, I saw him. *Ŝi amas min,* she loves me.

Ni lavas nin, we wash ourselves.

Si-n, himself, herself, itself, themselves.

Li amas sin, he loves himself. *Ŝi amas sin,* she loves herself. *Ili amas sin,* they love themselves.

"Possessive Pronouns" are formed by adding final *-a* to *mi, li, ŝi,* etc., etc. They are real adjectives, and agree in number and case with the nouns they refer to.

Mia libro, my book. *Miaj libroj,* my books.

La libro estas mia, nia, via, etc.

The book is mine, ours, yours, etc.

Li havas mian libron—miajn librojn (accus.).

He has my book—my books.

Sia refers to the subject of the clause, whether principal or subordinate, in which it stands.

Johano trovis sian libron, John found his book.

(That is John's own book), but,

Johano trovis lian libron, John found his book.

(Not John's book, but someone's else.)

Verb.—The *Conditional* mood ends in *-us.*

Se mi est-us riĉa, mi est-us feliĉa.

If I were rich, I should be happy.

The *Imperative* mood ends in *-u.*

Leg-u laŭte, read loudly. *Ne kur-u,* don't run.

Suffixes.—Ist denotes occupation.

Dento, a tooth. *Dent-ist-o,* a dentist.

Ar denotes a collection of the thing named.

Vorto, a word. *Vort-ar-o,* a dictionary.

An denotes a member, an inhabitant, a partisan.

Vilaĝo, a village. *Vilaĝ-an-o,* a villager.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EXERCISE III.

Mi vidis[1] vin *hieraŭ vespere.*[2] La juĝisto[3] admonis[4] la ŝtelisto.[5] La reĝo honoras[6] ilin, ĉar ili estas tre bravaj. Li havas mian plumon,[7] vian inkon[8] kaj iliajn kovertojn.[9] Iliaj domoj estas tre belaj. Tiu biciklo estas mia, tiu ĉi poŝhorloĝo[10] estas via kaj tiuj ĉi cigaroj estas iliaj. La pentristo[11] skribis al la juvelisto.[12] Li alvenos[13] *morgaŭ matene.*[14] Estas altaj[15] arboj[16] en la arbaro. Lia ŝipo[17] estas kun[18] la ŝiparo. Estas multaj[19] vortoj[20] en miaj novaj vortaroj. Ŝi admiris *sin,* ŝi ankaŭ[21] admiris ŝin. Ili lavis[22] *sin* kaj *ilin* en la rivero. Li perdis *sian* vortaron kaj *lian* krajonon.[23] Skribu la leteron tuj.[24] Ne parolu al li. Legu laŭte. La grupanoj de nia grupo[25] estas diligentaj. Li estas Parizano, kaj ili estas Londonanoj. Kiam[26] vi vidis lin? Mi neniam[27] vidis lin. Tiu knabo legas ĉiam.[28] Li alvenos morgaŭ matene, tiam[29] mi parolos kun li.

1 to see. 2 yesterday evening. 3 judge. 4 to warn. 5 thief. 6 to honor. 7 pen. 8 ink. 9 envelopes. 10 watch. 11 painter. 12 jeweller. 13 to arrive. 14 to-morrow morning. 15 high. 16 trees. 17 ship. 18 with. 19 many. 20 word. 21 also. 22 to wash. 23 pencil. 24 immediately. 25 group. 26 when. 27 never. 28 always. 29 then.

Pri la horo:—Kioma[1] horo estas, mi petas[2]? Ĝi estas tagmezo.[3] Ĝi estas noktomezo precize.[4] Ĉu vi scias[5] la horon, sinjoro? Estas la dua. Malmultaj[6] minutoj post la dua. Estas dek minutoj post[7] la tria. Kvarono[8] post la kvara. Duono[9] post la sepa. Kiam li alvenis? Je tri kvaronoj post la deka. Kiam mi venos[10] vin vidi[11]? Je la tria. Ne pli malfrue[12] ol la tria. Ĉirkaŭ[13] la tria. Inter[14] la tria kaj la kvara. Venu ĉe la bato[15] de la unua. Iom[16] post la naŭa. Ĉu vi povas diri[17] al mi kioma horo estas? Mi ne scias certe, mia poŝhorloĝo[18] haltis.[19]

1 what. 2 to request. 3 midday. 4 precisely. 5 to know. 6 few. 7 after, past. 8 a quarter. 9 half. 10 to come. 11 to see. 12 late. 13 about. 14 between. 15 stroke. 16 a little. 17 to tell. 18 watch. 19 to stop.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ESPERANTO-ENGLISH VOCABULARY.

A.

aĉeti, to buy.
adiaŭ, adieu.
admoni, to warn, to exhort.
aero, air.
afero, affair, matter.
agi, to act.
aĝo, age.
akra, sharp.
akvo, water.
al, to, towards.
alia, other.
alkonduki, to bring, to lead.
almenaŭ, at least.
almozo, alms.
alporti to bring, to carry...to.
alta, high.
alveni, to arrive.
ambaŭ, both.
ami, to love.
amiko, friend.
analizi, to analyze.
angla, English.
angulo, a corner.
ankaŭ, also.
ankoraŭ, still, yet.
antaŭ, before.
apenaŭ, hardly, scarcely.
arbo, tree.
ataki, to attack.
atenta, attentive.
aŭ, or.
aŭ...aŭ, either...or.
aŭskulti, to listen.
aŭtuno, autumn.
avo, grandfather.

B.

babili, to chatter, prattle.
baldaŭ, soon.
bastono, stick.
batali, to fight.
bedaŭri, to be sorry for.
bela, beautiful, fine.
bezoni, to want, need.
biblioteko, library.
biciklo, bicycle.
biero, beer.
bileto, ticket.
blanka, white.
blinda, blind.
bona, good.
boto, boot.
botelo, bottle.
bovo, ox.
bovaĵo, beef.
brili, to shine (intrans.).
brosi, to brush.
bruli, to burn (intrans.).
bruna, brown.
brusto, breast, bosom.
brustvesto, bodice.
butiko, shop.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

C. ĉ.

ĉambro, room.
ĉapelo, hat, bonnet.
ĉar, because, since.
ĉarma, charming.
ĉe, at, with.
ĉemizo, shirt, chemise.
ĉeno, chain.
certa, certain.
ĉesi, to cease.
ĉevalo, horse.
ĉia, every (kind of).
ĉial, for every reason.
ĉiam, always.
ĉie, everywhere.
ĉiel, in every way.
ĉies, everyone's.
cigaro, cigar.
ĉio, everything.
ĉiom, all (quantity).
ĉirkaŭ, about, around.
ĉiu, each, every one.
ĉu, sign of interrogation.

D.

danci, to dance.
danki, to thank.
dato, date.
datreveno, anniversary.
daŭri, to continue.
de, of, by, from.
defendi, to defend.
dekstra, right (opp. to left).
demandi, to ask a question.
demeti, to take off.
densa, dense.
dento, tooth.
devi, must, ought.
deziri, to desire, wish.
dimanĉo, Sunday.
Dio, God.
direkti, to direct.
diri, to say.
disdoni, to distribute.
diveni, to guess.
domo, house.
doni, to give.
dormi, to sleep.
drapo, cloth.
dum, during, whilst.

E.

eble, perhaps, possibly.
ekspozicio, exhibition.
ekster, outside.
eliri, to go out.
en, in, into.
endivio, endive.
enpaki, to pack up.
envio, envy.
episkopo, bishop.
erari, to err.
esperi, to hope.
esti, to be.

F.

fali, to fall.
fari, to do, make.
feliĉa, happy.
femuro, thigh.
fermi, to close.
fiera, proud.
filo, son.
fini, to finish (trans.).
fingringo, thimble.
fiŝo, fish.
flanko, side.
floro, flower.
foje, times (as, 3 times, etc.).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for, away, away from.
formeti, to put away.
forgesi, to forget.
forporti, to carry away.
forta, strong.
frapi, to knock, strike.
frato, brother.
fraŭlo, single man, bachelor.
frua, early.
fumi, to smoke.
funto, pound (weight or sterling).
futo, foot (measure).

G. Ĝ.

gado, codfish.
gajni, to gain.
ganto, glove.
ĝardeno, garden.
ĝentila, polite, courteous.
ĝis, till, until, up to.
glaso, glass, tumbler.
grado, degree, grade.
granda, great, large.
grava, grave, serious.
ĝui, to enjoy, have the use of.

H.

hajlo, hail.
halti, to stop, halt.
havi, to have.
hieraŭ, yesterday.
hodiaŭ, to-day.
homo, man, human being.
honori, to honor.
horo, hour.
horloĝo, watch, clock.
hotelo, hotel.
hundo, dog.

I.

ia, some kind of.
ial, for some reason.
iam, some time, ever.
ie, anywhere, somewhere.
iel, in some way.
ies, someone's, anybody's.
infano, child.
inter, among, between.
io, something.
iom, a little, somewhat.
iri, to go.
iu, some one.

J. Ĵ.

jako, jacket.
jaro, year.
jen estas, here is, here are.
jes, yes.
ĵeti, to throw.
juĝi, to judge.
juna, young.
jupo, skirt.
ĵurnalo, newspaper.
ĵus, just now.
juvelo, jewel.

K.

kafo, coffee.
kalkulo, bill, a/c.
kampo, field.
kandelo, candle.
kanti, to sing.
karto, card.
kastelo, castle.
kato, cat.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

kelka, some, a few.
kelnero, waiter.
kesto, coffer, chest.
kia, what sort of.
kial, why.
kiam, when.
kie, where.
kiel, how.
kies, whose.
kio, what (thing).
kiom, how many, much.
kiu, who, what.
klara, clear, distinct.
knabo, boy.
kolumo, collar.
kombilo, comb.
komercisto, merchant.
koni, to know.
kontraŭ, against.
korbo, basket.
kosti, to cost.
kotleto, cutlet.
koverto, envelope.
kovri, to cover.
krajono, pencil.
kredi, to believe.
krimo, crime.
kuiri, to cook.
kukaĵo, pastry.
kuri, run.
kuraci, to cure.
kurso, course, class.
kuzo, cousin.
kvankam, although.
kvazaŭ, as if.

L.

labori, to work.
lakto, milk.
larĝa, wide.
lasi, to leave, let.
lasta, last.
latuko, lettuce.
laŭ, according to.
laŭdi, to praise.
laŭta, loud.
lavi, to wash.
leono, lion.
letero, letter, epistle.
libro, book.
lito, bed.
litotuko, bed-sheet.
loĝi, to dwell.
longa, long.

M.

magistrato magistrate.
manĝi, to eat.
manumo, cuff.
mastro, master.
mateno, morning.
matura, ripe.
meleagro, turkey.
mendi, to order goods, etc.
mensogi, to tell lies.
meti, to put.
minuto, minute.
monato, month.
mono, money.
morgaŭ, to-morrow.
morti, to die.
movi, to move (trans.).
multa, many.

N.

naski, to give birth to.
ne, no, not.
nebulo, fog, mist.
neĝo, snow.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nek, neither.
nenia, none, no kind of.
nenial, for no reason.
neniam, never.
nenie, nowhere.
neniel, by no means.
nenies, no one's.
nenio, nothing.
neniu, no one.
nepo, grandson.
nevo, nephew.
nigra, black.
nokto, night.
noktomezo, midnight.
nordo, north.
nova, new.
nubo, cloud.
numero, number (No.).
nun, now.
nur, only.

O.

objekto, object, thing.
oficejo, office.
ofte, often.
okazi, to happen, to occur.
ol, than.
ombrelo, umbrella.
ondo, wave.
onklo, uncle.
ordinara, ordinary.

P.

paca, peaceful.
pafi, to fire (a gun).
pagi, to pay.
paki, to pack.
pano, bread.
pantoflo, slipper.
pantalono, trousers.
paro, pair, brace.
paroli, to speak.
paŝo, step.
patro, father.
pejzaĝo, landscape.
penco, penny.
pensi, to think.
pentri, to paint.
per, by, with, by means of.
perdi, to lose.
peti, to request.
pezi, to weigh (intrans.).
piedo, foot.
piro, pear.
plej, most.
pli, more.
plori, to weep.
plumo, pen, feather.
pluvo, rain.
polico, police.
pomo, apple.
por, for, in order to.
pordo, door.
porti, to bear, carry.
poŝo, pocket.
post, after, behind.
poŝto, post (letters, etc.).
prava, right.
precipe, chiefly.
premio, reward, prize.
preni, to take.
preskaŭ, almost.
preter, beyond, past.
pri, about, concerning.
printempo, spring.
pro, for, because of.
proksima, near.
promeni, to take a walk.
prudenta, reasoning.
puni, to punish.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

punto, lace.
pura, clean.

R.

rabi, to rob.
rakonti, to relate, tell.
razi, to shave.
reĝo, king.
regno, state.
resti, to remain.
restoracio, restaurant.
riĉa, rich.
ricevi, to receive.
ridi, to laugh.
rigardi, to look at.
robo, robe, gown.
rosti, to roast.

S. Ŝ.

ŝafo, sheep.
saĝa, wise.
ŝajni, to seem, appear.
salti, to jump.
sana, healthy.
sapo, soap.
se, if.
sed, but.
scii, to know.
sekundo, second (time).
sekvi, to follow.
ŝelko, brace (trousers).
semi, to sow.
sendi, to send.
servisto, servant.
ŝilingo, shilling.
sinjoro, Mr., Sir.
ŝinko, ham.
ŝipo, ship.
skribi, to write.
skui, to shake.
ŝlosi, to lock.
sola, alone.
soldato, soldier.
somero, summer.
ŝpari, to spare.
spiri, to breathe.
stacidomo, railway station.
ŝteli, to steal.
strato, street.
ŝtrumpo, stocking.
sub, under.
sufiĉa, sufficient.
ŝuo, shoe.
supo, soup.
sur, on.

T.

tablo, table.
tamen, however, but.
tapiŝo, carpet.
taso, cup.
teatro, theatre.
teo, tea.
terura, terrible.
tia, such a (kind of).
tial, therefore.
tiam, then.
tie, there.
tiel, thus.
ties, that one's.
timi, to fear.
tio, that (rel. pron.).
tio ĉi, this (rel. pron.).
tiom, as much, as many.
tiu, that (demon. adj.).
tiu ĉi, this (demon. adj.).
tondri, to thunder.
trenĉi, to cut.
trankvila, calm.
tre, very.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tro, too, too much.
trovi, to find.
truto, trout.
tualeto, toilet.
tuj, immediately.
tunelo, tunnel.
turo, tower.
tute, quite, entirely.

U.

urbo, city.
utila, useful.
uzi, to use.

V.

vagono, railway carriage.
valizo, valise.
vano, vain.
varma, warm.
veni, to come.
venki, to vanquish.
vento, wind.
vera, true.
verŝi, to pour.
vespero, evening.
vesti, to dress.
veŝto, vest, waistcoat.
vetero, weather.
viando, meat, viand.
vidi, to see.
vilaĝo, village.
vino, wine.
vintro, winter.
viziti, to visit.
vojo, way, road.
vojaĝi, to travel.
voli, to be willing.
vorto, word.

Z.

zono, belt.
zorgi, to care for.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED